

VOL. LXXVIII, 4

WHOLE No. 312

9

AMERICAN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1957

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

HENRY T. ROWELL

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN, JAMES H. OLIVER

JAMES W. POULTNEY, JOHN H. YOUNG

EVELYN H. CLIFT: Secretary

Honorary Editors

KEMP MALONE, BENJAMIN D. MERITT

DAVID M. ROBINSON

OCTOBER, 1957

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Centuriate Assembly Before and After the Reform. By LILY ROSS TAYLOR, - - - - -	337
Notes on the <i>πρὶ ὅψους</i> . By G. M. A. GRUBE, - - - - -	355
The Archonship of Symmachos. By BENJAMIN D. MERITT, - - -	375
<i>Aeneid</i> III and the Aeneas Legend. By ROBERT B. LLOYD, - - -	382
Modern Greek Corrections to Buck's <i>Dictionary</i> . By DONALD C. SWANSON, - - - - -	401
REVIEWS: - - - - -	414
<i>Lobel and Page's Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta</i> (LLOYD W. DALY).— <i>Page's Sappho and Alcaeus</i> , an Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry (LLOYD W. DALY).— <i>Mariotti's Il Bellum Poenicum e l'arte di Nevio</i> (HENRY T. ROWELL).— <i>Turner's The Hibe Papyri</i> , Edited with Translations and Notes; with the collaboration in the edition of No. 198 of <i>M.-T. Lenger</i> (JOHN DAY).— <i>Martinet's Économie des changements phonétiques</i> (FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR.).— <i>Finley's Pindar and Aeschylus</i> (FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN).— <i>Lewis' The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians: A Study of the Nobility from 44 B. C. to 68 A. D.</i> (J. F. GILLIAM).— <i>Lowe's Codices Latini Antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century. Part VII: Switzerland</i> (LUDWIG BIELER).— <i>Goodenough's Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, Vols. V and VI: Fish, Bread and Wine</i> (FRANZ LANDSBERGER).— <i>De Almeida's Egitânia: história e arqueologia</i> (JAMES H. OLIVER).	
INDEX TO VOLUME LXXVIII, - - - - -	453

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$6.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 50 cents, Canadian postage 25 cents, extra); single numbers, \$2.00 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Henry T. Rowell, The Johns Hopkins University; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 8, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXXVIII, 4

WHOLE No. 312

THE CENTURIATE ASSEMBLY BEFORE AND AFTER THE REFORM.

Scholars who, in the years since the discovery of the *Tabula Hebana*, have discussed the centuriate assembly have been almost unanimous in accepting the clear indications of Cicero (*R. P.*, II, 39) that after the third century reform, as before, the assembly consisted of 193 voting units. But in spite of the fact that the method of constructing voting centuries in the early imperial assembly of senators and knights of the *Tabula Hebana* was strikingly similar to the method Mommsen imagined for the centuries of classes two to five, there has not been unanimity in accepting Mommsen's remarkable reconstruction of the reformed assembly. The objections raised by Schönbauer, Staveley, and Dell'Oro to Tibiletti's vindication of Mommsen's views have been admirably answered in this Journal by J. J. Nichols.¹ But Nichols' explanation of the reform as nothing more than an administrative measure, with the substitution of one citizen list

¹ *A. J. P.*, LXXVII (1956), pp. 225-54, with references there to discussions by G. Tibiletti, E. Schönbauer, E. S. Staveley, A. Dell'Oro, and F. Gallo. See also Staveley's more recent paper with bibliography, *Historia*, V (1956), pp. 112-22. For another detailed discussion of the reform of the centuries (inconclusive in result), see Christian Meier, *s. v.* "Praerogativa centuria," *R.-E.*, Suppl. VIII (1956), col. 567-98, esp. 575-83. For a succinct statement of the evidence for the reform (in general in accord with Tibiletti's views) see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford, 1957), note on Polyb. VI, 14, 7. For the text of the *Tabula Hebana*, see J. H. Oliver and R. E. Palmer, *A. J. P.*, LXXV (1954), pp. 225-49.

by tribes, classes, and ages for two separate lists, one by tribes and one by centuries, classes, and ages, is not convincing. For the tribes were the basis of the census, and therefore of the list on which the Servian centuries depended.

Separation of tribes and centuries in the Servian organization is indicated only by Livy, I, 43, 12-13, a passage now illuminated by Nichols' interpretation.² What Livy says there, in effect, is that the system of Servian centuries, with class and age groups,—which still prevailed at the time Livy was writing—did not conform to the number of tribes instituted by Servius, for they were only four, the four urban tribes, and that these tribes had nothing to do with the distribution and the number of the centuries. Clearly, Livy, unlike authorities quoted by Dionysius, does not attribute to Servius the creation of the rural tribes out of the *pagi* in the Roman *ager*.³ Here and elsewhere he avoids the problem of the origin of the rural tribes, though he assumes their existence in his narrative under the years 504 and 495 (II, 16, 5; 21, 7). These are the tribes in which the men with property in the 170 centuries of *pedites* would in general have been registered. Livy is insisting only on the fact that the *four urban tribes* had nothing to do with the distribution and number of the Servian centuries.

With this interpretation of Livy, it is even possible to assume that, as soon as the rural tribes were instituted, the centuries of

² *Nec mirari oportet hunc ordinem qui nunc est post expletas quinque et triginta tribus, duplicato earum numero centuriis iuniorum seniorumque, ad institutam ab Ser. Tullio summam non convenire. Quadri-fariam enim urbe divisa . . . partes eas tribus appellavit . . . neque eae tribus ad centuriarum distributionem numerumque quicquam pertinere.* Particularly significant is Nichols' interpretation of *summam* as the total number of Servian tribes, an interpretation supported by the *enim* of the next sentence.

³ Fabius, Vennonius, and Cato are quoted by Dionysius, *Ant.*, IV, 15, in a passage that may be based on Varro. See Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, III (Leipzig, 1887), pp. 166-71; Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, I (Halle, 1909), pp. 364 f. Like Fabius and Vennonius, the unknown writer on Servius Tullius cited below, note 10, apparently attributed to Servius the creation of tribes out of *pagi*. For an excellent summary of the evidence for the origin of the rural tribes see G. Botsford, *The Roman Assemblies* (New York, 1909), Chap. III. For a recent suggestion, see F. Cornelius, *Untersuchungen zur frühen röm. Geschichte* (Munich, 1940), pp. 106 f.

pedites made up of landholders were drawn each from a single rural tribe.⁴ In that case Livy is not using the language of a later period, when under the years 396 and 383 (V, 18, 1; VI, 21, 5) he describes the vote of the centuriate assembly as action of the tribes. But the coordination of tribes and centuries would have required a complete reorganization of the centuriate assembly on each of the five occasions from 387 to 299 when new tribes were added, and it is difficult to see how the weighted vote of the first class could have been maintained when the number of tribes varied from twenty-one to thirty-three. An admixture of tribes characterized the *equites* and the unarmed centuries of the original assembly, and it also characterized the *pedites* in the centuries of the army. The Servian centuriate organization seems to have incorporated the *pedites* of the army, and I shall assume that, until after the reform, the centuries of *pedites* were groups mixed from various tribes.⁵

But that does not mean that the centuries of *pedites* were not dependent on the tribes for their organization. These centuries were divided by age into *seniores* and *iuniores*, and by census rating into five classes, their armor depending on the

⁴ Beloch, *Röm. Geschichte* (Berlin, 1926), pp. 270 ff., 290 ff., argued that originally tribes and centuries were coordinated, and that later the coordination was abandoned, to be restored in the third century reform. Beloch's bold theories, accepted by Ernst Meyer, *Röm. Staat und Staatsgedanke* (Zurich, 1948), pp. 54 f., depend on his substitution of an arbitrary set of his own dates for the ancient tradition on Roman constitutional development. I find the tradition more satisfactory than the dates posited by Beloch and other modern scholars, among whom U. Coli may be cited as a proponent of the view that tribes and centuries were always coordinated. See his paper "Tribù e centurie dell'antica repubblica romana," *Stud. et Doc. Hist. et Iuris*, XXI (1955), pp. 181-222.

⁵ The mixture of tribes in the centuries provides a parallel to the *phylae* of Cleisthenes, which were also mixtures of local units. For another parallel, see Hugh Last, *J. R. S.*, XXXV (1945), pp. 30-48, esp. 39 f. It is possible that Livy (I, 43, 13) has the admixture of local districts in mind in his use of *centuriarum distributio*. The real or supposed relation of *tribuere* to *tribus* is evident in the use of the compounds *attribuere* (see *T. L. L.*, § 4) and *contribuere* (*T. L. L.*, § 1), but not, in Mommsen's view (*op. cit.*, III, p. 96, note 1), in *distribuere*. See, however, Vell., II, 20, 2: *cum ita civitas Italiae data esset, ut in octo tribus contribuerentur novi cives . . . Cinna in omnibus tribubus eos se distributurum pollicitus est.*

class division.⁶ The *pedites* could not have been established without the census, also reportedly an institution of Servius Tullius. The only practicable basis of a census is local, and Dionysius (IV, 14-15), in an account that probably goes back to Varro, says that the Servian census was taken in the urban tribes and in the rural districts, which he refers to both as tribes and as *pagi*. The relation of tribes to the census is shown by the role of the censors in creating new tribes, and by the activity of the censors of 312 and 304 (and of later years) in assigning the *humiles* or the *libertini* to the tribes.⁷ The censor's task of dividing the people by tribes into age groups and property groups, described in one of Cicero's laws for his ideal state,⁸ must have been as old as the censorship. The *tributum*, the citizen tax, collected by tribes, depended in amount on the census rating, and the officers who collected it, and who, after army pay was established, paid the soldiers, the *tribuni aerarii*, were apparently officers of the tribes.⁹

The levy of troops in the Servian organization, which was

⁶ On the military character of the Servian centuries, see Last, *op. cit.* Last agrees with Fraccaro (see *Athenaeum*, N.S. XII [1934], pp. 57-71 for the controversy with De Sanctis) that the original Servian organization, dating from the end of the monarchy, consisted of a single *legio*. According to Fraccaro, the organization of the *seniores* was a later development. The use of the centuries for voting was secondary, though that, too, was attributed to Servius Tullius. See Livy, I, 43, 10; 60, 3. On recent discussions of the origin of the *comitia centuriata*, see Staveley's interesting summary, *Historia*, V (1956), pp. 75-84, with bibliography on pp. 120-2.

⁷ The tribes instituted in 387 and 358 fall in a period when the names of censors are not recorded, but the tribes created in 332, 318, 299, and 241 all belong to censorial years. See Broughton, *M.R.R.*, under the years. Specific relations of the censors with the new tribes are indicated for 332 (Livy, VIII, 17, 11), 318 (Festus, p. 212 L.), and 299 (Livy, X, 9, 14). On censors and tribes, see Mommsen, *op. cit.*, II³, pp. 400 ff. On the censorships of 312 and 304, see Livy, IX, 46, 10-15; Diodorus, XX, 36. Mommsen's interpretation of these censorships is to be radically revised in the light of Fraccaro's epoch-making paper, "Tribuni ed aerarii," *Athen.*, XI (1933), pp. 150-72.

⁸ *De Leg.*, III, 7: *populique partis in tribus describunto, exin pecunias, aevitatis, ordinis partiunt, equitum peditumque prolem describunto.*

⁹ Livy, I, 43, 13; Varro, *L. L.*, V, 181. Cf. Dion., IV, 14-15 and, for a conflicting account, IV, 19, discussed in note 13 below. On the *tribunus aerarius*, see Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 189 f.; Lengle, *R.-E.*, s. v.

made by classes in the census, was also, according to Dionysius (IV, 14-15), carried out by tribes. The *pagi*, from which the tribes were derived, are mentioned as the source of the levy of soldiers in a tantalizing fragment from an unknown writer on Servius Tullius: *exque pagis milites conquirebantur [et tributum ? e] pagis cogebatur*.¹⁰ There is evidence before the reform for the relation of tribes and levy. In the war against Labici in 418, Livy describes a type of levy that differed from the usual method. Ten tribes were selected by lot, and the soldiers were chosen from them (IV, 46, 1): *Dilectum haberi non ex toto passim populo placuit; decem tribus sorte ductae sunt; ex iis scriptos iuniores duo tribuni ad bellum duxere*. This indicates that the normal method of levy was *ex toto passim populo*, that is from all the twenty-one tribes existing at the time.¹¹ The tribes were the basis of the levy of 275, when M'. Curius Dentatus summoned potential recruits to the Capitol.¹² According to the most detailed account, none of the *iuniores* responded to the call, and Curius put the names of all the tribes in an urn. When the name of the Pollia came out first, he drew by lot the name of a man from that tribe, and confiscated his property and sold him into slavery when he failed to respond.

It has been argued, on the basis of a conflicting account in Dionysius, that this levy by local units, the tribes, did not follow the method that was usual before the reform of the centuriate

¹⁰ *Pap. Oxyr.*, XVII (1927), no. 2088. The text has been discussed and restored by M. A. Levi, *Riv. Filol.*, LVI (1928), pp. 511-15 and by A. Piganiol, *Scritti in onore di B. Nogara* (Città del Vaticano, 1937), pp. 373-80. The text and the restorations are printed in G. Lugli, *Fontes ad topog. vet. urb. Romae pert.*, I (Rome, 1952), p. 74. The tribes and *pagi* of the fragment refer, I believe, to the *ager* of Servian Rome, not to the city, and for that reason Levi's restorations seem to me preferable to Piganiol's. See also Festus, p. 268 L., with Mommsen's suggestion for emendation, *op. cit.*, III, p. 194, note 2.

¹¹ For the later use of *quinque et triginta tribus* for the whole people, see the passages cited by Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, p. 173, note 4.

¹² Varro, *ap. Non.* p. 28 L.: *Manius Curius consul, Capitolio cum dilectum haberet nec citatus in tribu civis respondisset, vendidit tenebrionem*. Val. Max., VI, 3, 4: *M'. Curius consul, cum dilectum subito edicere coactus esset [et] iuniorum nemo respondisset, coniectis in sortem omnibus tribubus, Polliae, quae prima exierat, primum nomen urna extractum citari iussit neque eo respondente bona adolescentis hastae subiecit . . . et bona eius et ipsum vendidit*. See also Livy, *Per.*, XIV.

assembly; that the levies of 418 and 275 may have been emergency calls, such as characterized a *tumultus*.¹³ But, quite aside from the fact that the ordinary machinery would have to be used in an emergency, these accounts of levies by tribes accord with Polybius' description (VI, 19-20) of the levy of troops for the four legions raised each year. Polybius is, of course, describing the system in vogue after the reform of the centuriate assembly. Here, as in the levy of Curius, the order of the tribes in supplying soldiers was determined by lot. Each tribe presented four men at a time, and the four legions had choice by turns from these men. The result would have been four legions, each made up of all the tribes in which men with property ratings were registered.¹⁴ That was presumably the old method of recruitment, and it seems to have persisted after the reform of the centuries, though by the time of Polybius inequalities in available manpower in the various tribes must have resulted in unequal representation of the tribes in the legions.¹⁵

¹³ Dionysius, IV, 19, in conflict with IV, 14-15, explains in detail that the centuries were the basis of the levy and of the collection of taxes. Accepting this account for the levy, E. Gabba, in a supplement to his valuable discussion of the professional army (*Athen.*, XXIX [1951], pp. 251-6), argues that the levies were not carried out by tribes until the middle of the third century. Gabba's view is accepted by Walbank, *op. cit.* in note 1 above. See his commentary on Polyb., VI, 19, 5. As Gabba indicates, the usual view of historians, which I accept, is that census, collection of *tributum*, and levy had always depended on the tribes. See, for instance, Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, p. 247 and *passim*; Liebenam, s. v. "Dilectus," *R.-E.*, col. 596; Fraccaro, *op. cit.* in note 7 above, p. 154; Botsford, *op. cit.*, p. 59. The relation of the census to the tribes has been disregarded in most recent discussions of the reform of the centuriate assembly.

¹⁴ According to Mommsen (*op. cit.*, III, p. 279, note 4), the method of levy described by Polybius could have been used both before and after the reform.

¹⁵ In Polybius' account all the available recruits of all the tribes appear on the Capitol, but that was impossible in the second century when citizens were scattered over a wide area. See Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, II (Halle, 1924), pp. 225 f. Shortages in the supply of men for levies are attested in the difficult times of the Second Punic War. See Livy, XXIII, 32, 19 for levies in Picenum. For later shortages, see on the year 169 Livy, XLIII, 14, when the censors sent out edicts *per fora et conciliabula*, and for 152 Appian, *Hisp.*, 49, when, as was reported for M'. Curius, the lot was employed in the selection of

The voting centuries before the reform must have been similarly mixed from the various tribes. Originally the centuries of *iuniores* were probably the actual centuries in service in the single legion that made up the Roman armed forces, but divergence would have resulted not only from the development from hoplite to manipular tactics, but also from the increase of the army from one legion to two and, by the fourth century (Livy, VIII, 8, 14), to four legions. In these four legions there were 240 centuries, 60 to a legion, in classes 1-3. In the voting assembly these 240 centuries and the *iuniores* who had completed their term of service, as well as all the *seniores*, would have had to be crowded into the 120 centuries allotted to these three classes. There must have been some binding force in the centuries thus created. I suggest that it was the legion in which the men were serving or had formerly served; that, of the 80 centuries of the first class, perhaps 20 centuries made up of veterans (both *seniores* and *iuniores*) and men on active service were assigned to each of the four legions.¹⁶ For the organization of the assembly there must have been tribal lists by classes and age groups, perhaps with records of years of army service.¹⁷ Such lists would also have been used for the levies, and would have been available to Curius when he drew a name by lot from the rolls of the Pollia tribe.

These lists, whose prior existence I assume, became the basis recruits. It is the view of some scholars (see, for instance, Last, *op. cit.*, in note 5 above, p. 41) that the legionaries served in territorial units from the third century. But, as Beloch has shown (*op. cit.* in n. 4 above, p. 576), local contingents before the Social War belong regularly to Latin colonies or allied communities; the one exception to the rule is provided by the special Capuan forces attached to Roman legions before Capua went over to Hannibal. On the probable dearth of recruits in some of the older rural tribes, see note 33 below.

¹⁶ For evidence that the legions were known by numbers in the third-second centuries, see M. E. Agnew, *A. J. P.*, LX (1939), pp. 214 f., with his reference in note 1 to the controversy on the subject.

¹⁷ See Nichols, *op. cit.*, p. 250, who assumes the existence of independent lists by tribes and centuries. Our information on the lists is inadequate. See Mommsen's scheme, *op. cit.*, II³, pp. 405 ff., for two types of list, one for taxes which could have served for the tribal assembly, and one for the army which would have served for the centuriate assembly. But Mommsen says that there may have been only one list, used for different purposes.

of the reform of the centuriate assembly after the last two tribes were added. The lists would have included all five classes, and the various suggestions that the lower classes were not coordinated with the tribes are, in my opinion, to be rejected. Thus, in accordance with Livy's statement, *duplicato earum <tribuum> numero centuriis iuniorum seniorumque*, there would have been 350 units, 70 from each tribe, to share the group vote in the assembly. These units, if we can judge from imperial inscriptions, were known as centuries.¹⁸ In the first class each of the seventy tribal centuries made a voting century, but in the lower classes the 280 tribal units were combined to create one hundred voting groups, such as Mommsen suggested, and such as we now know from the *Tabula Hebana*.¹⁹ These groups were also known as centuries, but they had no permanent existence, for, like the centuries of the *Tabula Hebana*, they were created by lot at the meeting of the assembly.²⁰ They maintained for the assembly a limited admixture of tribes in the lower classes.

¹⁸ For the evidence, see Nichols, *op. cit.*, pp. 251 f.

¹⁹ See Tibiletti, *Athen.*, XXVII (1949), pp. 210-45; Nichols, *op. cit.*, with the lucid statement, pp. 226 f., of the evidence supplied by the *Tabula Hebana*. In their total of 100 centuries, classes two to five had ten more votes than they had had in the old assembly, in which classes two, three, and four each had twenty votes and class five had thirty. I suggest that the ten additional votes were added to class five, giving it a total of forty centuries. Possibly a lowering of the census rating for this class took place at the time of the reform, with a consequent increase in the number of men enrolled in the class. (But see E. Gabba, *Athen.*, XXVII [1949], pp. 175-87, who dates the first reduction in 214-12.) Under the system I have proposed, the twenty voting centuries in classes two to four could have been produced through selection by lot of three tribal units in each class to vote in each of ten urns, with four tribal units for each of ten additional urns. The fifth class could have had ten urns for the vote of one tribal unit and thirty for two.

²⁰ The voting centuries of the first class, identical with the members of the tribe in the first class of each century, were actually permanent units, and enrollment in the first class may be referred to by Q. Cicero, *Comm. Pet.*, 18: *qui abs te tribum aut centuriam aut aliquod beneficium aut habent aut sperent* (with Buecheler's emendation for *ut habeant sperent* of the MSS). But the passage probably refers to enrollment in a century of knights. See Cic., *Mur.*, 74, an allusion to Murena's role in obtaining a place in these centuries for his stepson. The *album centuriae* of the Pseudo-Acro Scholiast on Cicero, p. 189 Stangl, may also refer to the first class, though, since it is coupled with the *Caeritum tabulae* which were apparently abolished in the third century or earlier,

The reform also brought a change in the order of voting. In the old assembly the centuries of knights (12 or 18?) had voted first and had had their votes announced separately. These centuries, described as *praerogativae*, could influence the outcome of the election in accord with the will of the senate, for the senatorial class was strong in the centuries of knights. In the new assembly twelve centuries of knights now voted with the seventy centuries of the first class, and the six most ancient centuries, known as the *sex suffragia*, voted between the first and the second class. A new arrangement was made for a *centuria praerogativa*. One of the centuries of the first class was chosen by lot, and cast its vote and had the results announced separately.²¹ In the three cases where we know the identity of the *praerogativa*, it was a century of *iuniores* of a rural tribe, and Mommsen suggested that in the lot for this century the urban tribes, and possibly the *seniores*, were excluded.²²

But here the *Tabula Hebana* gives some important evidence. The special assembly of senators and knights, which functioned in the *destinatio* of consuls and praetors, seems to have replaced the *centuria praerogativa*.²³ Here two, not four, of the

the passage may reflect conditions before the reform. The censors, according to the Scholiast, *cives sic notabant: ut qui senator esset, eiceretur senatu; qui eques Romanus, equum publicum perderet; qui plebeius, in Caeritum tabulas referretur et aerarius fieret ac per hoc non esset in albo centuriae suae. . . .* On this passage see Fraccaro, *op. cit.* in n. 7 above, pp. 165 f. On the *ni quis scivit centuria*, a bit of antiquarian lore in Festus, p. 184 L., and on the passage from Q. Cicero, see Nichols, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

²¹ There is no proof that the change in the *praerogativa*, which took place between 296 and 215, occurred at the time when the centuries were coordinated with the tribes, but it seems likely. Meier, however (*op. cit.* in note 1 above, col. 564), is skeptical. Botsford, *op. cit.*, pp. 214 f., and, more tentatively, Fraccaro, *Athen.*, XII (1934), pp. 62 f., suggest that the reform was gradual. See also, on the centuries of knights, Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 292 f.

²² Livy, XXIV, 7, 12—9, 3; XXVI, 22; XXVII, 6. See Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, p. 293, note 5. It is possible, but not probable, that the twelve centuries of knights, who voted with the first class, had a share in the lot for the *praerogativa*. But see Meier, *op. cit.*, col. 572, 583.

²³ The suggestion that this assembly took the place of the *centuria praerogativa* was first made by Coli (*Not. Sc.*, 1947, p. 65, note 4) and was supported by Tibiletti (*op. cit.* in note 19 above, p. 221). It has been widely accepted. But see Meier, *op. cit.*, col. 592.

urban tribes were eliminated from the ballot, namely, the Suburana and the Esquilina, and the lots were drawn from thirty-three tribes. I think that Augustus, when he created this special assembly in 5 B. C., followed republican precedents, and that, after the reform, the Suburana and the Esquilina were eliminated from the lot for the *centuria praerogativa*. Contrary to the usual view, these two tribes, in the republic as in the empire, were inferior to the other two urban tribes, the Palatina and the Collina.²⁴ During the republic old patrician families were registered in the Palatina, and there were senators and other respectable men in the Collina, and a dearth of such men in the Suburana and Esquilina. It seems not unlikely that the *praerogativa* of the reformed assembly was chosen from thirty-three tribes of *iuniores*, the men of military age, who could fittingly be given the position of greatest influence in a military assembly.

The new assembly did not, I believe, represent a divorce between the military and the political organization.²⁵ The 170 centuries of *pedites* were still divided into five classes, and these classes retained importance in the legions. Although some of the distinctions of armor in the five classes had disappeared, the men of the first class, who had great power in voting, were still,

²⁴ See my paper, "The Four Urban Tribes and the Four Regions of Ancient Rome," *Rend. Pont. Accad. di Arch.*, XXVII (1952-54), pp. 225-38. My collection there of republican evidence for individuals in the four urban tribes showed twelve names in the Palatina, including patrician Aemilii, Claudii, and one Cornelius, eighteen names in the Collina, including two senators and two *scribae*, one name in the Suburana, probably a *tribunus militum* and so potentially a senator, and no names in the Esquilina. It is clear that in the republic as in the empire men were reluctant to claim registration in the Esquilina and the Suburana. In connection with the name of the man in the Suburana who was probably of the senatorial class, I cited the provision in the *Tabula Hebana*, lines 32-3, for the votes of possible senators in the Suburana and the Esquilina. I suggested that the leading position of the Suburana in the *ordo tribuum*, the basis of Mommsen's view of the importance of this tribe in the republic (*op. cit.*, III, p. 164), was derived from religious processions.

²⁵ Tibiletti, *op. cit.*, p. 240, speaks in connection with the reform of "lo sdoppiamento dell'ordinamento militare da quello politico, cioè il tramonto dell'antico cittadino-milite." Cf. De Sanetis, *Storia dei Romani*, II (Turin, 1907), p. 207.

in the time of Polybius (VI, 23, 15), distinguished from the other *pedites* by the right to wear the *lorica*. They were the *classici*, and all the other *pedites* were *infra classem* (Gell., VI, 13, 1). Classes one to three still provided the heavy armed troops, and classes four and five supplied the light armed forces, the *velites*.²⁶ The men in the 170 voting centuries of the new assembly were still *pedites*, though they were no longer marshalled, like army units, in thoroughly mixed tribal groups. But in their new tribal units they comprised the veterans and, in the *iuniores*, the entire manpower that could be called to the defense of the Roman state.²⁷ Because of its direct relation to the levy, the new organization was, as Nichols suggests, a simplification.

But there must also have been political reasons for the new voting system in the reform. Was it made in the interests of the senate and the nobility, or of the people? Dionysius (IV, 21, 3), in a comment on a change of the assembly, *εἰς τὸ δημοτικώτερον*, which, I think, refers to this reform,²⁸ suggests that it was in the interests of the people. Outwardly there were some democratic features, though they were much less marked than they would have been if the new assembly had had the 373 voting centuries assigned to it by Pantagathus. But the substitution, for the knights, of a century of the first class to serve as a *praerogativa* and the diminution of the votes of the first class, with the consequent necessity of going down to the second class before a decision could be reached, would seem to give more power to lower income groups.

But the result was not democratization.²⁹ The number of new men acquiring the consulship actually declined after the re-

²⁶ This is the usual interpretation of Polybius, VI, 21-3 in combination with the evidence for the armor of the Servian classes. See De Sanctis, *loc. cit.*

²⁷ For the continued importance of the *suffragatio militaris* in this assembly at a time when the classes in the army had disappeared, see Cicero, *Mur.*, 38, with the comment, *imperatores enim comitiis consularibus . . . deliguntur*.

²⁸ See Nichols, *op. cit.*, pp. 234, 252 f. I do not agree with him in his tentative preference of the reading *κρίσεως* for *κλήσεως*.

²⁹ This has been pointed out repeatedly. See De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, III, 1 (1916), p. 344, who held that the reform was democratic in purpose but not in result; Staveley, *A.J.P.*, LXXIV (1953), pp. 24 ff., who maintains that the purpose was not democratization.

form, and there was a marked diminution in the numbers of new men who, through fame in war, gained repeated consulships and censorships.³⁰ What, then, was the purpose of the reform?

My explanation, following, in general, suggestions of Herzog and Fraccaro,³¹ is that the men responsible for the reform acted in the interests of the nobility, and that the nobility had found the tribes easier to manipulate than the centuries. By the time of the reform, the centuries, which represented soldiers and veterans, must have had more members from the extensive populous new tribes than from the older rural tribes, many of which, confined to small, scantily populated districts, could hardly have supplied full quotas for the army. The soldiers and veterans in the centuries, predominantly from the newer tribes, and therefore including many new citizens, were subject to the influence of officers under whom they had served, and their votes may have been responsible for bringing to repeated consulships and censorships men who emerged as able generals in the Third Samnite War, the war against Pyrrhus, and the First Punic War. The nobles had not been having things all their own way in the centuriate assembly.

Meantime they had been more successful with the tribes.

³⁰ In the half century before 241, the earliest possible date for the reform, there are thirteen new names in the consular *fasti*: Curius, Caecilius, Caecilius, Fabricius, Coruncanus, Carvilius, Ogulnius, Mamilius, Otacilius, Aquilius, Aurelius, Fundanius, Lutatius. In the half century after 241 there are nine such names: Pomponius, Publicius, Apustius, Flaminius, Mucius?, Terentius, Villius, Porcius, Acilius. Of new men who were repeatedly elected to the highest offices by the *comitia centuriata*, there are five in the years 290-241, all renowned in war: Sp. Carvilius, cos. 293, 272, censor 289?; M'. Curius Dentatus, cos. 290, 275, 274, censor 272; C. Fabricius, cos. 282, 278, censor 275; M'. Otacilius, cos. 263, 246; C. Aurelius Cotta, cos. 252, 248, censor 241. In the next half century there are only two such men, C. Flaminius, cos. 223, 217, censor 220 (whose fame did not depend on achievements in war), and M. Porcius Cato, cos. 195, censor 184. The diminution of new men in the *fasti* after the reform has often been explained by the demand for experienced generals in the Second Punic War.

³¹ See Herzog, *Röm. Staatsverfassung*, I (Leipzig, 1884), pp. 320-7; Fraccaro, "La riforma dell'ordinamento centuriato," *Studi in onore di P. Bonfante* (Milan, 1930), I, pp. 103-22. I have also had the opportunity of discussing the subject with Professor Fraccaro. His views are accepted by De Visscher, *Rev. hist. du droit français et étranger*, XXIX (1951), p. 37.

Branches of old families had registered in the new tribes, leaving other branches in the older rural tribes.³² The nobles must already have made progress in creating the effective political organization of the tribes that functioned in the late republic. It is to be noted that, from the *lex Hortensia* of 287, which made plebiscites binding on the the whole state, until the tribunate of C. Flaminius in 232, radicals seem in general to have been kept out of the tribunate of the plebs, and revolutionary legislation seems to have been checked. The local organization in use in the tribal assembly could now be applied to the centuriate assembly, and as Fraccaro pointed out, the nobles could profit particularly from the small number of men of the first class in the depopulated old rural tribes,³³ a group whose vote counted far less in the old centuriate assembly.³⁴

Even more susceptible of manipulation, I believe, were the centuries, and particularly the all-important first class centuries, of the urban tribes. That is not the general view. It is usually

³² For a list of republican senators by tribes, see Mommsen, *Gesam. Schr.*, VIII, pp. 350-5 (first published in *Ephem. Epig.*, IV in 1881). Extensive additions to the list will be published in my forthcoming monograph, *Tribes and Senators in the Roman Republic*. Particularly striking is the number of patricians registered in tribes established from 387 to 299.

³³ Of the seventeen rural tribes instituted before 387, the Papiria, with the addition of Tusculum, the Horatia with Aricia, the Veturia with Ostia and possibly Caere (*C. I. L.*, XI, 3615), and the Cornelia, if it was the tribe of Nomentum, had had their boundaries extended. See the evidence under the tribes and towns in Kubitschek, *Imperium Romanum Tributim Discriptum* (Vienna, 1889) and in the index of Beloch, *op. cit.* in note 4 above. The Sergia, the tribe of Cures and Trebula Mutuesca, had already, by the middle of the third century, had additions in a separated region, and the same thing may have been true of the Claudia, the Pollia, and, possibly, the Clustumina. But all or most of the other old rural tribes had probably had little extension of territory. How could the Romulia, hemmed in on the right bank of the Tiber by the Veientane tribes, have supplied a quota of recruits as large as that of the Teretina or the Falerna?

³⁴ Staveley's objection (*A. J. P.*, LXXIV, pp. 28 f.) to Fraccaro's idea of the advantages of the old depopulated tribes is that few would have come to the comitia from the distant tribes. But politicians of the late third century would have been not less successful than their descendants of the age of Caesar in bringing large groups of men in the first class to the elections in the centuriate assembly. See my *Party Politics*, Chap. III.

held that the five classes of the urban tribes were made up mainly of freedmen, with the richest in the first class. But if I am right that the assembly continued to have a military character, freedmen must have been excluded from the classes which made up the assembly, for freedmen did not serve in the *pedites*.³⁵ Who then voted in the classes, and particularly in the first class, of the urban tribes? The senators in the Palatina and the Collina would have cast their votes in the first class of these tribes if they had given up the *equus publicus*, and there would have been some other respectable men in these two tribes. But the Suburana and the Esquilina, which, I have suggested, were excluded from the lot for the *praerogativa*, may have had almost no voters in the classes, and they may even have been filled up for the comitia, as we know tribal units were in the late republic, by small delegations from other tribes.³⁶

Whether or not I am right about the character of the classes, and particularly the first class in the urban tribes, the small representation in the old rural tribes would, from the standpoint of the nobles, have more than made up for the loss of ten centuries of the first class. The second class, which replaced these ten centuries in creating a majority, was doubtless as easy

³⁵ For the evidence, see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, III, pp. 448-51. Mommsen assumed that freedmen who had landed property originally served in the legions, but that they were limited to subordinate services after the censorship of Fabius in 304. They certainly did not serve in the legions in the Second Punic War or later. The *libertini*, who had been placed in the four urban tribes by Fabius in 304, seem later, in some numbers, to have secured registration in the rural tribes again, but they were forced back into the four urban tribes by censors of the period 234-220 (Livy, *Per.* XX). Since I do not think that the freedmen were in the classes, I have refrained from discussing the view of Rosenberg, *Untersuch. zur römisch. Zenturienverfassung* (Berlin, 1911), pp. 81 ff., that the centuriate assembly was reorganized in order to diminish the influence of the rich freedmen who, in Rosenberg's opinion, had become prominent in the first class of the old assembly. Fraccaro, *op. cit.* in note 31 above, p. 119, concedes that there may be something in Rosenberg's point of view about the freedmen, but argues that a more important object of the reform was to lessen the influence of new citizens in the first class. My view that the freedmen were excluded from the classes seems not inconsistent with Fraccaro's subsequent comments on the decline of the urban tribes, *op. cit.* in note 7 above, p. 170.

³⁶ Cic., *Sest.*, 109; *Tabula Hebana*, line 33, with the note of Oliver and Palmer, *op. cit.* in note 1 above.

to control as the first.³⁷ The *praerogativa* remained a danger, for the lot might fall on a tribe out of control, but Q. Fabius Maximus and Q. Fulvius Flaccus showed in the Second Punic War that they could manage the *praerogativa* and get consulships for themselves and for men whom they trusted.³⁸

The reform had a semblance of democracy that justified Dionysius' statement about it, but it seems really to have been carried out in the interests of the nobility. That conclusion has bearing on the date of the reform in the interval between 241 and 218. There seems no reason to assign it to the great democrat, C. Flaminius, who was censor in 220. It should be assigned to other censors who completed the *lustrum* in this period. They entered on office in the years 241, 234, 230, and 225. The most probable date is the time when the last new tribes were created, 241. Indeed, the long delay in establishing these two tribes out of Sabine and Picene territory, conquered respectively in 290 and 268, may perhaps be explained by opposition to more new tribes with new citizens while the old voting centuries still existed. The organization of the tribes may have had to wait until someone was found to devise the intricate plan for the new assembly. As Fraccaro has suggested, the plan was perhaps intended to deter the Romans—as it did, except for an abortive attempt after the Social War—from creating more new tribes for new citizens. Whoever devised the new plan, it was probably carried out by the censors of 241.³⁹

But a fragmentary *elogium*, found recently at Brundisium, has led Vitucci and, more tentatively, Staveley to attribute the

³⁷ Whether, as Staveley holds (*A.J.P.*, LXXIV, p. 32, followed by Meier, *op. cit.*, col. 588 f.), the *sex suffragia* were placed between the first and second class to "act as *praerogativae* for the second class" seems to me doubtful.

³⁸ See note 22 above.

³⁹ It is possible that, as in 189-88 (see Broughton, *M.R.R.* on tribunes of the plebs in these years) and in the period of the enfranchisement of the Italians after the Social War, censorial action was accompanied by legislation. The censors of 241 were C. Aurelius Cotta and M. Fabius Buteo. The former was one of the new men elected to high office several times during the war. But that does not mean that he would have opposed the reform, for new men, eager to keep for their families the distinction they had acquired for themselves, were frequently not interested in the advancement of other new men.

reform to the censor of 230, Q. Fabius Maximus.⁴⁰ The subject calls for a brief discussion which will not cover all the problems created by the important inscription. The *elogium*, on a tablet such as accompanied statue bases with name and *cursus honorum* in the Forum of Augustus, is not a copy of the *elogium* set up there, which we know from a copy found at Arretium. The margins of the inscription from Brundisium are preserved below and above and on the left side, but there is no evidence for the length of the lines. The text reads as follows:

PRIMUS. SENATUM. LEGIT. ET. COMITI
BARBULA. COS. CIRCUM. SEDIT. VI
DIUMQUE. HANNIBALIS. ET. PRAE
MILITARIBUS. PRAECIPUAM. GLOR

If, as I believe, this is a Roman and not a local *elogium* of Brundisium, the censorship held when a Barbula was consul and the indication of service against Hannibal clearly identify the man as Q. Fabius Maximus, whose censorship began in the consulship of M. Aemilius Barbula in 230. I agree with Ribezzo, Vitucci, and Staveley that *comiti* is to be restored as a form of *comitia*. It is tempting to follow Vitucci, restore *comiti[a ordinavit]*, and attribute the reform of the *comitia centuriata* to Fabius. But the difficulty is with the statement *primus senatum legit*, for *lectiones* of the senate are, as Vitucci notes, attested for censors long before Fabius. The second part of the line must have included something to explain the claim for primacy. I suggest as a restoration of the beginning of the *elogium*: *primus senatum legit et comiti[a eodem anno descripsit M. Pera M.] Barbula cos.*⁴¹ The point would be that Fabius.

⁴⁰ First published by F. Ribezzo, *Il Carroccio del Sud*, N. S. IV, no. 2 (1951), pp. 4-5 (not available to me); cf. *Ann. Epigr.*, 1954, no. 217. A photograph accompanies G. Vitucci's discussion, *Riv. Filol.*, LXXXI (1953), pp. 43-61. See also Staveley, *Historia*, V, p. 119.

⁴¹ The *T.L.L.* shows no case of *describere* with *comitia*, whereas Vitucci's *ordinare* has a parallel in Suetonius, *Vitel.*, 11. But *describere* is the usual word for the censor's activity in taking the census of knights and people. See note 8 above and other cases cited in *T.L.L.* Compare also Cic., *Tusc.*, IV, 1, *equitum peditumque descriptio*, which would perhaps be equivalent to *comitia centuriata*, and Livy, IV, 4, 2 (from Canuleius' speech), *census in civitate et descriptio centuriarum classiumque*. I have hesitated to restore *centuriata* or *cent.* with *comitia* since the addition would make the line rather long. Another

after completing the *lectio senatus*, regularly the censor's first task, succeeded in completing in the same year the census of *equites* and *pedites* represented in the *comitia centuriata*. The restoration would explain the consular date, which has seemed to provide a reason for assigning the inscription to a local official of Brundisium.⁴² The claim of primacy in such speedy action of a censor whose term could run for eighteen months is probably valid, for there is no instance in our records of a censor who completed the *lustrum* under the consulship in which he took office.⁴³ There is perhaps a subtle implication that Fabius was not always a *cunctator*. This *elogium* cannot, I think, be used to date the reorganization of the *comitia centuriata*. In fact, if my restoration is in essence correct, the *elogium* may show that Fabius was not the author of the reform, for in that case he would hardly have completed his task so quickly.

To summarize the results of my paper: The tribes, as the basis of the census on which the Servian organization was founded, were always related to the centuries. Before the reform, the centuries seem to have been made up of men from various tribes, assigned according to the system by which units in the legions continued to be filled a century after the reform. Membership in the assembly, like the choice of recruits for the army, depended on tribal lists of men divided into classes and age groups. Perhaps the members of a given voting century were determined by the legion in which they had served. After the reform, the lists of the 35 tribes with their divisions provided 350 units or centuries from which 170 voting centuries of *pedites* were created in the assembly. On the method of voting I have in general accepted the results of Tibiletti and Nichols' interpretations of the *Tabula Hebana*. I have argued, also on analogy from the *Tabula Hebana*, that two of the urban tribes were eliminated from the lot for the *praerogativa*. The reform,

possible addition would be *in tribus* or *tributim*, both frequently used with *discrēbere*.

⁴² See Vitucci, *op. cit.*, pp. 48 f., with the report of a discussion with Professor A. Degraasi.

⁴³ See Mommsen, *op. cit.*, II³, p. 352, with note 5. The only recorded instance of such a completion of a *lustrum*, Livy, XXIX, 37, 1, is evidently placed under 204 by mistake, for Livy says specifically that the *lustrum* took place *serius*.

which was administratively a simplification, did not, I hold, represent a divorce between the military and the political organization. The *comitia centuriata* remained a military organization, representing the entire manpower of the Roman state, with particular emphasis on the *pedites*, who still held 170 of the 193 centuries. The reform, though seemingly democratic, was carried out in the interests of the nobility. The nobles would, as Fraccaro argued, have profited from the vote in the depopulated old rural tribes; in my opinion they would have derived advantage too from the urban tribes, where *pedites* may have been almost non-existent. The most probable date of the reform is 241, when the last tribes were added. A recent attempt to assign the reform to Q. Fabius Maximus in 230 is based on an *elogium* for which I have suggested a different interpretation.

LILY ROSS TAYLOR.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

NOTES ON THE ΠΕΡΙ ΥΨΟΥΣ.

I

The meaning of τὸ ὑψος

The English translators and editors¹ seem to be agreed that 'sublime' is an unsatisfactory translation of ὑψος, but they continue to use it; few of them give any clear idea of what Longinus is writing about. For this the author himself is partly responsible for he, wisely perhaps, never defines his subject but only describes various aspects of it. Nowhere does he analyze a pass-

¹ It is not my purpose to raise the question of date or authorship here; where the name Longinus is used in what follows, it means simply, without prejudice, the author of the treatise.

The following editions, translations, and monographs were used in the preparation of these notes, and where I refer to them in the text, I do so by the name of the author only: G. de Petra, *Dionysii Longini de Grandi sive Sublimi* (Cologne, 1612); L. Langbaine, *Longinus: Liber de Grandiloquentia* (Oxford, 1638); J. Tollius, *Dionysii Longini De Sublimitate* (Utrecht, 1694; this edition also contains Boileau's translation); L. Welsted, *The Work of Dionysius Longinus on the Sublime or a Treatise concerning the Perfection of Writing* (London, 1712); L. Pearce, *Dionysii Longini De Sublimitate* (London, 1743); J. Toup, *Dionysii Longini Quae Supersunt* (Oxford, 1806); B. Weiske, *Dionysii Longini De Sublimitate* (London, 1820); W. T. Spurdens, *Longinus on the Sublime in Writing* (London, 1836); D. B. Hickie, *Dionysius Longinus On the Sublime* (London, 1838); G. M. A. Pujol, *Traité du Sublime de Longin* (Paris, 1853); O. Iahn, *Διονυσίου ἡ Λογικὴ περὶ ὑψους* (Bonn, 1867); A. Jannakaris, *Annotationes Criticae in Longini qui fertur περὶ ὑψους libellum* (Marburg, 1880); H. L. Havell, *Longinus On the Sublime* (London, 1890); G. Meinel, *Dionysios oder Longinos über das Erhabene* (Kempten, 1895); A. O. Prickard, *Longinus on the Sublime* (Oxford, 1906); *Libellus de Sublimitate* (Oxford text, 1906); Rhys Roberts, *Longinus on the Sublime* (2d ed., Cambridge, 1907); I. Vahlen, *De Sublimitate Libellus* (revision of Iahn; 4th ed., Leipzig, 1910); H. F. Müller, *Die Schrift über das Erhabene* (Heidelberg, 1911); W. H. Fyfe, *Longinus on the Sublime* (Loeb, Harvard, 1927; reprinted 1953); P. S. Photiades, *περὶ ὑψους* (Athens, 1927); T. G. Tucker, *Longinus on Elevation of Style* (Melbourne, 1935); F. Granger, *The Treatise on the Sublime by Longinus* (London, 1935); R. von Scheliha, *Die Schrift vom Erhabenen* (Berlin, 1938); H. Lebègue, *Du Sublime* (Budé; Paris, 1939); A. Rostagni, *Anonimo del Sublime* (Milan, 1947).

age which he considers ὑψηλός in all its aspects or give us all the reasons why it deserves to be so described.

He is clearly *not* using either the noun or the adjective in the sense in which we meet them elsewhere. Their usual meaning in critical works, as we see it in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, is grandeur, and it refers to the grand manner or style in diction or composition.² In the *Letter to Pompey*, for example, Dionysius describes Plato's diction as a mixture of two styles, τοῦ τε ὑψηλοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἰσχνου, while in the *Demosthenes* the word ὑψηλός is applied to the rhythms of composition. It is often coupled with μεγαλοπρεπής, and is in fact very close to it in meaning.

This meaning has unduly influenced editors and translators of our treatise, as when Rhys Roberts says (p. 23) "But the Greek title Περὶ τοῦ Ὑψους 'Concerning Height or Elevation' does not convey that idea of abnormal altitude which is often associated with the word sublime. The object of the author is to indicate broadly *the essentials of a noble and impressive style*" (my italics). This is certainly *not* the author's purpose. Grandeur of *conception* is for him closely allied to ὕψος, but it does not require grandeur of expression or a grand style. Many of his examples have nothing of the grand manner either in diction or in word-arrangement. This is obviously true of the examples given in the ninth chapter and highly praised: neither "the silence of Ajax in the underworld" (*Od.*, XI, 363-7), nor the quotation from Genesis, nor the prayer of Ajax (*Iliad*, XVII, 647) has anything noble or grand about the *style* but only in

² The references in the text are *Letter to Pompey*, 2 (where the adjective is used three times in a discussion of Plato's diction) and *Demosthenes*, 39. Other uses in Dionysius are found in the same letter 4 and 6, in *Lysias*, 13 (twice), in the *Composition*, 4, 17 and 18, and in *Demosthenes*, 28 and 34. The word is frequently used together with μεγαλοπρεπής. In the *Thucydides*, 18, Pericles' funeral speech is called τὴν ὑψηλὴν τραγωδίαν ἐκείνην. Prickard (p. xviii) says of ὕψος: "It means simply 'height,' and we have no reason to think that, before the treatise of Caecilius, it or its adjective had been used in any fixed literary sense." This may be technically correct if Caecilius' treatise was written before all the above works of Dionysius, but the above references seem to show, on the contrary, that in Caecilius' own circle the word was current in the sense of the grand or elevated diction or style, and that, if he used it in any other sense, Caecilius was deliberately altering the meaning. But, of course, we do not know in what precise sense Caecilius actually used it.

idea; indeed the style is very plain. Even grandeur of conception, for all the importance attached to it, is not essential, and we find that *ὑψος* can be attained without it, either by imagination (15, 3) or by means of good composition, as notably in Euripides (40, 2).

Clearly, *ὑψος* in our treatise does not mean the grand manner or style. In fact, Longinus seems deliberately to avoid any formula of styles, and he is not thinking in those terms at all. What makes a passage great to him is not whether its style, either in diction or in word-arrangement (the two departments of style recognized by all ancient critics), is grand or plain or intermediate, but whether it carries us off our feet, for that is the first and necessary characteristic of *ὑψος* (1, 4). In this first description of his meaning he speaks almost slightly of the more orthodox critical requirements such as *εὐρεσις*, *τάξις*, *οἰκονομία*, at least by comparison: "Skill of invention, arrangement and structure of subject-matter, these we perceive emerging slowly, not from one or two passages, but from the texture of the whole work, whereas *ὑψος* comes suddenly at the right moment; like a flash of lightning it carries all before it and displays the writer's full powers at one stroke."

The various aspects of *ὑψος* are never related to one another, and the author's enthusiasm for the particular quality he is describing carries him away; he speaks as if this particular aspect were the thing itself. In 9, 3 it is greatness of mind, as it is also in 35; in 10 it is the capacity to select the significant details and to weld them into a living whole; in 39 it is rhythm, and so on. It is this which led Lebègue to say (p. xx), following Croiset: "l'auteur appelle *ὑψος* tantôt le sublime proprement dit, tantôt la simple élévation des pensées et des sentiments, tantôt l'éclat des images ou la puissance de l'effet dû à la composition." On the other hand, Tucker is led by the emphasis on distinguished diction at the end of the first chapter to suggest that *ὑψος* means excellence of expression, but his translation as 'elevation of style' is a poor translation indeed.

Longinus seems to have learnt from Plato, with much else, an active dislike of technical terms. For this he had some excuse, for, as we know, other critics loved technicalities too well. He uses a large number of synonyms or near-synonyms for *ὑψος*, and the same words loosely in different senses. Perhaps the

best way to discover what he had in mind is to examine briefly the uses of these words.

The most common are μέγεθος, both singular and plural, and other words of the same root, and these obviously refer to some kind of grandeur or greatness. The singular is used as practically equivalent to ὕψος at least eleven times (1, 1; 7, 1; 8, 1; 12, 2 twice; 16, 1; 17, 2; 33, 1; 33, 2; 36, 1; 42, 1), and yet in 30, 1 it is only one of several qualities, and in 40, 4 it refers to a particular kind of rhythm. It seems to be a more general quality than ὕψος, for at 12, 1 the author is objecting to defining αὔξησις in terms of μέγεθος, and he says that the latter is produced by ὕψος, but also by πάθος and by the use of tropes. One gets the same impression from other passages, as when Timaeus, in spite of his tendency to frigidity, is said to be not without μέγεθος (4, 1), or when Longinus speaks of the ebb and flow of μέγεθος in the *Odyssey*. There is also the expression διὰ ὑπερβολὴν μεγέθους (9, 5), which cannot be entirely complimentary (see V below). I do not think Longinus could have spoken of ὑπερβολὴ ὕψους. He does, it is true, speak of trying to reach beyond ὕψος, but there he is describing the vice of turgidity (3, 4). The non-technical uses of μέγεθος (e. g. 35, 1 and 38, 3) need not detain us.

The plural μεγέθη is used once or twice as a synonym of ὕψος (3, 4 and perhaps 40, 1, for which see below), but it refers as a rule rather to the *elements* of greatness (e. g. 11, 1), to great passages or great qualities which go to make up ὕψος rather than to the thing itself, though the distinction is not always clearly maintained (12, 2; 15, 3; 17, 2; 33, 2; 39, 3). This plural also is used in a non-technical sense (9, 1; 9, 10; 10, 7).

Other synonyms from the same root are less frequent, but some of them are rather surprising. The singular μέγα is always definitely synonymous with ὕψος (7, 3; 9, 3; 16, 3; 36, 1), and the plural is used once instead of μεγέθη for the scattered constituents of ὕψος (40, 1). We also find μεγαλήγορον (8, 4), μεγαλόρρημον (23, 2) and μεγαλληγορία (16, 1), though this last word is also used for a special quality which, along with others, results from imaginative representations (15, 1). The verb μεγεθύνω is used at least once (13, 1) and possibly twice (13, 1) in the sense of achieving ὕψος.

The only other apparent synonyms of ὕψος are τὰ ὑπερφύα, at

most three times (1, 4; 9, 4, but probably not at 9, 6, see below, V); βάθος once (2, 1, see II below); ὑψηγορία twice (8, 1; 34, 4; at 13, 4 it, together with μεγαλοφροσύνη, produces ὕψος); and ὑψηλοφανής (24, 1, but perhaps this only gives the appearance of ὕψος). ἐξοχή might be considered a synonym at 10, 3, but it probably only means distinction; at 1, 3 ἐξοχή λόγων is only an important element in ὕψος; at 10, 7 ἐξοχαί are the vital points in a situation.

Δίαισις, διάρμα, διηρμένα are not synonyms of ὕψος. They retain their natural meaning of 'distinction' and 'distinguished' (2, 2; 8, 1; and 12, 1: τὸ μὲν ὕψος ἐν διάρματι, ἡ δ' αὖξησης ἐν πλήθει) and we are told that διηρμένα should be examined to see whether they are really great or have only the appearance of greatness (7, 1). Neither is κάλλος a synonym; it is used very infrequently; it is of course a desirable quality but always one of several (6, 1; 20, 1; 30, 1) and Longinus evidently had a dislike of mere prettiness of language as he makes clear in 33, 5, and in his comparison of Hypereides and Demosthenes where he says (34, 4): τὰ μὲν ἐτέρου καλά, καὶ εἰ πολλὰ ὁμῶς ἀμεγέθη.

Our author evidently had two things mainly in mind: the metaphor of height, and greatness or vigour of conception. This last is never far away as is shown, for example, by the surprisingly favourable treatment of such a word as ὄγκος and its adjective ὄγκηρος, weight or dignity. There are bad ὄγκοι of course, as we see in the discussion of turgidity (3, 1-4 and cf. 30, 2), but it is usually a desirable quality and not infrequently coupled with ὕψος itself (8, 3; 12, 3; 15, 1; 28, 2; 30, 2; 39, 3; 40, 2). It is undeniable that μέγεθος comes close to the meaning of grandeur, but it is the grandeur of mental conception which is the most important source of ὕψος; it is the main subject of chapters 7-15, and it frequently reappears, notably in 35-6.

Even greatness of mind, however, is not absolutely essential, as we have seen, and this is one reason why 'sublime' is an unsatisfactory translation, the other reason being the Hebraic overtones. There are other factors which make for ὕψος: there is the music and rhythm of language, so essential to the Greeks; there is emotion or passion, though we can have ὕψος without it (8, 2); there is the use of figures; and there is good diction. Any combination of these, indeed, it would seem, any one of these except perhaps the last (8, 1) can produce ὕψος and, in

spite of his own predilection for mental vigour, Longinus recognizes the fact. He is not thinking so much of the greatness of a literary work as a whole as of those great passages which suddenly carry us out of ourselves (1, 4), and he does not expect even the greatest writers to be consistently ὑψηλοί. This is the reason why he uses plurals such as ὕψη, μεγέθη, ὑπερφυᾶ so freely.

What is the one common idea behind this deliberately vague and shifting terminology to describe his main subject? Havell (p. xxi) gives the answer in a simple phrase: "What is the test, after all, of the sublime, *by which our author means the truly great . . .*" (my italics), and so does Welsted's sub-title "On the Sovereign Perfection of Writing." Longinus is trying to answer the question, what makes great writing, or, if we want to preserve the metaphor, how do writers reach those sudden heights which we all recognize as great? But we cannot keep the metaphor, for words such as 'elevation,' which do, are the kind of technical term he avoided, and are in any case unsuitable. We must use some quite general term if we are to include all that he included, and his main family of synonyms will provide it. His treatise should be known as 'Longinus On Great Writing.' The tradition of centuries has probably made the title 'On the Sublime' inescapable, but I suggest that in the translation throughout the treatise the author's meaning will best be rendered by 'great writing,' 'great passages,' 'greatness,' as the most adequate translation of ὕψος, ὑψηλός and their synonyms, in every case.

II

2, 1: εἰ ἔστιν ὕψους τις ἢ βάθους τέχνη

In these first words of the second chapter the author is discussing the old commonplace: whether *rhetoricē*, good writing or speaking, is a matter of art, whether, that is, it can be taught.

The words ἢ βάθους have caused a good deal of unnecessary difficulty. βάθους has been emended to βάρους (W. Schmid in *Rhein. Mus.*, XLII, p. 446), μεγέθους (H. Diels in *Hermes*, XIII, p. 5), πάθους (adopted by Rostagni, Granger, Photiades), and even κατὰ βάθμους (Immisch). Iahn deleted the word, and a good many translators have ignored it (Boileau, Pujol). Rhys Roberts, after Meinel, suggested that βάθος might mean the opposite of ὕψος, i. e. *bathos*. He himself later withdrew this

translation (*C. R.*, XLIII [1929], p. 59), but we still find it in Prickard and Tucker, and also in *LSJ*, for we read there, under *βάθος*: "3. of lit. style, bathos," and a reference to this passage. Indeed this rendering is defended by E. D. T. Jenkins in *C. R.*, XLIV (1930), p. 174, his main argument being that ἤ is not used in the sense of *scilicet*, but then the two words are not meant to be quite synonymous.

In view of this authoritative support it should be bluntly stated that there is not one scintilla of evidence for this translation of *βάθος* as bathos. It makes nonsense of the passage, for who has ever *seriously* suggested an art of writing badly? Significantly, the meaning bathos in *LSJ* stands quite by itself without any other reference, but there are plenty of texts to show that *βάθος* is used to mean either height or depth, such as αἰθέρος βάθος in *Medea* 129γ for the depth of the sky, or its use in Plato's *Theaetetus* 184 a for depth of mind, referring to Parmenides—βάθος τι ἔχειν πάνυ γένναιον. Nor are these isolated usages. The word βαθύφρων belongs to the same order of ideas, and we may compare Plutarch, *Marcellus*, 17, 5 and *Fabius Maximus*, 1, 5 and 8: νοῦς . . . βάθος ἔχων.

In an interesting article on *βάθος*, its cognate *βαθύτης* and the adjective *βαθύς*, Friedrich Zucher (*Philologus*, XCIII [1938], pp. 31-60) seeks to establish the use of these words by Stoic writers as meaning imperturbability, the not being easily overcome by emotion, etc., and his examples show that the word *βάθος* is at times used as almost equivalent to μεγαλοψυχία. The point relevant here is that the word is often close to ὕψος in meaning, whatever the exact ethical import, and the examples given by Zucher usefully supplement those given in *LSJ* to show that *βάθος* is often used for depth of mind.

Moreover, the word is used by other critics and rhetoricians. Hermogenes in particular uses both *βαθύς* and *βαθύτης* quite freely. The adjective occurs half a dozen times in chapters 3, 5, and 9 of the *περὶ ιδεῶν*, and in 9 we also find: ἐπεὶ καὶ βίας πολλάκις καὶ βαθύτητος δεῖ καὶ μεγέθους τινος. *βαθύς* and *βαθύτης* occur five times in the *Ars Rhetorica* attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (cc. 8 and 9) in the sense of deep, significant, difficult. Perhaps the most interesting of these is the reference to the speech of Ajax in the embassy to Achilles as *βαθύτατος ἐν λόγοις πάντων*, i. e. his words have most depth. We should perhaps add

that Dionysius uses the word in his *Composition* (*ad init.*) where, referring to τὸ πρέπον, he says that the study of it is βαθεία. βαθύτης is also used by Philodemus and Cicero, though it is not always easy to decide whether the meaning is ethical or intellectual (Zucher, pp. 35-41 and *LSJ*, s. v.).

Clearly, the use of both nouns and adjective can be traced from the fifth century B. C. to the second century A. D. in the sense of 'depth,' as applied to the mind or soul, but it is not used anywhere in the 'opposite' sense. Longinus' insistence upon greatness or depth of mind as a factor in great writing—an aspect which had received little emphasis since Plato—makes the intellectual flavour of the word particularly suitable, even though it is probably used in a quite general sense. Rather than loftiness or grandeur, as those who keep the word are apt to translate it, Fyfe's 'profundity' is right, and the old translation, '*sublimitatis sive altitudinis*,' is not far out. But profundity is perhaps too intellectual, and we can probably not do better than the simple word 'depth.' As R. von Scheliha renders it: "ob es eine Lehre von der Kunst des Erhabenes oder des Vertiefens gibt," so we should translate: "whether greatness or depth in literature can be taught." In any case, there is no reason to emend the word, nor does any proposed emendation give half so good a sense.

III

4, 1: θατέρον δὲ ὃν εἶπομεν, λέγω δὲ τοῦ ψυχροῦ . . .

These first words of the fourth chapter, which deals with frigidity, refer to it as 'the other' or 'the second' of the vices already mentioned, but it is in fact the fourth, since three different vices are discussed in the third chapter, namely bombast, puerility, and parenthyrsus or false emotion. The reference is, obviously, to an enumeration which was lost in the lacuna between the second and the third chapters, and the latter begins in the middle of a discussion of bombast. Moreover, *θατέρον* must refer to the second of a pair, not of a longer list; it cannot therefore be identified with the second vice mentioned in 3, namely puerility. This is described as "an artificial conceit which ends in frigidity through over-elaboration," but it is obviously not identical with frigidity. This is pointed out by Müller (note *ad loc.*) and by R. Philippson in *Rhein. Mus.*, LXXIV (1925),

pp. 267-8. Philippson shows that, if frigidity is 'the other' vice, the former must include all three vices described in 3 as species of itself. This is confirmed by the expression *τρίτον τι κακίας εἶδος* applied to the third, parenthyrsus, and by the term *γένος* which is applied to frigidity just above. It follows that, in the lacuna, two main types of vices were mentioned, the first of which was then discussed under three aspects before the author went on to discuss frigidity.

To discover what this first main genus was we have to find what the three vices of the third chapter have in common. Philippson considers that all three of these faults are in the realm of passion and arise "auf dem übertriebenen oder falsch angebrachten Pathos," while frigidity is due to the lack of passion, i. e. "auf das Fehlen des Pathos, auf dem Haschen nach Erhabenheit, ohne selbst etwas zu fühlen." Frigidity, however, is as often due to a failure in communication as to a lack of emotion in the writer. The words which, after puerility, introduce parenthyrsus: *τούτῳ παράκειται τρίτον τι κακίας εἶδος ἐν τοῖς παθητικοῖς*, do not imply that the previous two faults were also *ἐν τοῖς παθητικοῖς*, but should be translated: "next comes a third species (of fault), in the realm of passion." For in fact neither of the two previous faults is described as in the realm of emotion. The quotation from Aeschylus is said to be theatrical (*παρὰ-τράγωδα*) rather than tragic: "the wreaths of flame, the vomiting to heaven, the turning of Boreas into a flute-player, and the rest—the result being not intensity but turgidity of language and confusion of images, *τεθόλωται γὰρ τῇ φράσει καὶ τεθορύβηται ταῖς φαντασίαις ἢ δεδείνωται*." The fault is one of imagery and of language, and the general term under which it seems to be condemned is *οιδεῖν*. The emotion of the writer is not in question. Longinus then goes on to give prose examples of the same fault, and the difficulty of avoiding turgidity; he tells us that *κακοὶ ὄγκοι*, bad swellings, are as bad in writing as on the body.

As for puerility, *μειρακιῶδες*, it is, as we have seen, an artificial conceit which becomes frigid through overelaboration; it is altogether petty (*ταπεινὸν καὶ μικρόψυχον*); in its desire to be unusual, original, and attractive, it lands itself in tawdriness and affectation. Here it would seem to be the idea itself which is artificial, and the fault to be one of thought rather than emotion. The language may be fine enough, but the idea cannot carry it.

Neither of these first two vices seems to be concerned with emotion.

The third fault, *parenthyrsus*, is specifically connected with passion. It is hollow, inappropriate passion where the subject does not justify it, and it cannot therefore be communicated; the writer may be passionately excited but the hearer or reader remains unaffected, *ἐξεστηκότες πρὸς οὐκ ἐξεστηκότας*.

It seems clear that passion is not what these three faults have in common, but the notion of 'swellings.' In a bombastic passage the idea may be fine enough, but the imagery and the language are turgid and inappropriate to the subject, and turgidity is a matter of language. Puerility, on the other hand, attempts to blow up a petty idea into something larger than it is. In *parenthyrsus* it is the emotion which is hollow and artificial and overelaborated into something bigger than it is. What is said of *ὄγχοι* in 3, 4 may well apply, in different ways, to the whole genus, for this seems the basic idea of all three vices: inappropriately swollen language, inappropriately swollen idea, and inappropriately swollen passion.

This, then, seems to have been the main idea of the first main vice, and frigidity is the second. What the precise name of the first main heading was we cannot tell, but the general idea seems reasonably clear.

IV

7, 2: φύσει γάρ πως ὑπὸ τἀληθοῦς ὕψους ἐπαίρεται τε ἡμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ γαῦρόν τι ἀνάθημα λαμβάνουσα πληροῦται χαρᾶς καὶ μεγαλαυχίας, ὡς αὐτὴ γεννήσασα ὅπερ ἤκουσεν.

The difficulty is *ἀνάθημα*. Manutius early conjectured *παράσθημα* (cf. 9, 1 in the sense of exaltation or *ἔκστασις*), and, as far as the sense goes, this is by far the best emendation, but it is not an easy one. Pearce, keeping *ἀνάθημα*, strangely translates it *elevatio (animi)*. Recent editors have adopted Ruhnken's *ἀνάσθημα* (so Iahn, Roberts, Fyfe, Lebègue, Rostagni, von Scheliha, Photiades), but *γαῦρον ἀνάσθημα λαμβάνουσα* is unparalleled Greek for "takes a proud flight" (Roberts), "exulte et prend l'essor" (Lebègue) or "gains a proud step upwards" (Fyfe, who obelizes in his Oxford text).

There does not seem any need of emendation, however, if we take the word in a sense akin to the Homeric *ἀναθήματα δαίτος*,

the delights of the feast, and, as often, Platonic usage will help us understand the meaning of Longinus. In *Hippias Minor* 364 b, Socrates is congratulating Hippias on his success in literary contests and he says: καὶ τῇ Ἑλίων πόλει τῆς σοφίας ἀνάθημα τὴν δόξαν τὴν σὴν καὶ γονεῦσι τοῖς σοῖς, which means of course that Hippias' reputation for wisdom is a source of pride and delight to his city and his parents. Another example of this usage is found in *Critias* 110 b where the statue of the armed goddess is said to have been an ἀνάθημα to the men and women of Athens in olden days, i. e. a source of joy and pride.

Thus used, ἀνάθημα means something which gives joy and pride, as, in the sense of offerings, ἀναθήματα do to the gods, and this sense excellently suits the passage before us: our soul takes delight in great writing; we are filled with joy and pride as if we had written the passage ourselves. The ὕψος is to our souls as the reputation of Hippias is to his city and his parents, as the statue of the armed goddess was to the legendary Athenians, as music and the feast are to Homer's banqueters. We should translate: "The truly great naturally exalts our soul which accepts it as a source of proud delight; it is filled with joy and pride as if it had itself created what it heard."

V

9, 4-8: τὸ ἐπ' οὐρανὸν ἀπὸ γῆς διάστημα κτλ. . . .

This passage follows a lacuna. Most commentators and translators (except von Scheliha and Müller) appear to believe that all the passages quoted from Homer in what follows are highly praised. The words quoted obviously refer to the description of Strife in *Iliad*, IV, 440-5. Longinus continues: "One might say that this is a measure of Homer's stature as well as of that of Eris," and the passage is favourably compared with the description of Gloom in the Hesiodic *Shield* which is "not fearful but disgusting." He then goes on to quote three more passages of Homer, or rather three groups of lines, for his memory appears to be at fault. The last of these (*Iliad*, XIII, 18; XX, 60; XIII, 19 and 27-9) consists of descriptions of Poseidon and is praised unreservedly.

Not so, however, the first two passages. The first, *Iliad*, V, 770-2, describes the divine steeds of Hera leaping as far as man

can see, at one bound. Longinus' comment is curious: "He measures their pace by cosmic dimensions. Who could not properly exclaim, *because of this extravagance of grandeur*, διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ μεγέθους, that, if the divine steeds were to leap twice, they would find no place to land in the universe?" Surely, extravagance or excess of grandeur must be adverse criticism; one cannot imagine the author speaking of extravagance of ὕψος, for μέγεθος does not have the same meaning here.

The second passage (*Iliad*, XXI, 388 and XX, 61-5) describes the earth quaking as the gods descend to battle, till Hades leaps up in fear that the underworld will be exposed to the view of gods and men. Here too the comment seems ambivalent. These things are indeed ὑπερφύα (overpowering, extraordinary, not an exact synonym of ὕψος here); "they are terrifying, φόβερα, and yet, from another point of view they are, unless interpreted allegorically, altogether impious and transgress the limits of good taste, παντάπασιν ἄθρα καὶ οὐ σώζοντα τὸ πρέπον."

Longinus is not championing allegorical interpretation; he is criticizing Homer because only allegory can save him from impiety and lack of taste, and no Greek critic ever regarded the lack of πρέπον as anything but a serious fault. We may also remember that fear is an emotion *not* conducive to ὕψος (8, 2), so that δεινά and φοβερά too are doubtful praise. Then comes the famous comment: Homer "made the men of the Trojan war into gods, and the gods into men," and the rest. After this we are told: "Far better than the Battle of the gods are those passages which represent the divine as something undefiled, mighty and pure," and as examples, come the lines on Poseidon. This, the quotation from Genesis, the prayer of Ajax—all this is fully praised.

The lacuna is tantalizing, but it seems clear that it leads up to Homeric passages which have a certain grandeur that the Hesiodic passage lacks, which are indeed terrifying but fall short of perfection. In the lacuna Longinus may well have established a difference between such passages and true greatness. Certainly the first quotations from Homer are not praised unreservedly, but are said to have serious defects.

VI

- 10, 7: ἀλλὰ τὰς ἐξοχάς, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, ἀριστίνδην ἐκκαθήραντες ἐπισυνέθηκαν, οὐδὲν φλοιῶδες ἢ ἄσεμνον ἢ σχολικὸν ἐγκατατάττοντες διὰ μέσου. λυμαίνεται γὰρ ταῦτα τὸ ὅλον, ὥσανεὶ ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα ἐμποιοῦντα μεγέθη συνοικονομούμενα τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλα σχέσει συντετειχισμένα.

This passage ends the chapter and the discussion of a writer's capacity to choose the most apt elements (καίρια in 10, 1) in a situation and weld them into an organic unity (ἐν τι σῶμα) by proper arrangement (ἐπισυνθέσει). This particular quality has been illustrated by the great ode of Sappho, by descriptions of storm-scenes in Homer, Aristaeas, and Aratus, and by a reference to Demosthenes. It is then once more described in the words quoted above, and illustrated by a metaphor from building. The first sentence offers little difficulty: "The salient points" (Roberts' rendering of ἐξοχαί) are chosen, polished, and harmonized according to merit. The meaning of ἐκκαθαίρειν is the same as in *Rep.* 361 d, where it is used of a sculptor putting the finishing touches on a statue, i. e. polishing it up and also removing accretions and impurities. This sense is highly appropriate as great writers have "nothing superficial, trivial, or artificial" between their vivid details; every word tells, every detail is relevant, and ἀριστίνδην implies awareness of the relative importance of each point.

The last sentence, however, is usually given up as hopeless or emended. The first words are clear enough: "for these things (the φλοιώδη, ἄσεμνα, σχολικά) spoil the whole (passage or work), like. . . ." Like what? The root of the difficulty is that the ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα, the chinks and fissures (see Roberts, p. 174), correspond to the φλοιώδη, etc. which are the subject of λυμαίνεται, so that one would naturally take the former as the subject of the next clause, of which the verb is understood from λυμαίνεται, and of the participle ἐμποιοῦντα. Roberts proposed an ἐς before μεγέθη but even so no very clear sense can be extracted. H. von Arnim (*Wiener Studien*, XXIV [1902], pp. 448-51) suggested reading: ἐν ποιοῦντες τὰ μεγέθη συνοικονομουμένη τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλα σχέσει συντετειχισμένα, but the masculine of the participle is very awkward.

I do not believe any emendation to be necessary, and that the

text can be interpreted if we realize that the author has been careless of his word-order. This a Greek could usually afford to be as the inflected forms kept the sense clear, but when, as here, both object and subject are neuter plural, confusion arises. Logically, *ψύγματα* and *ἀραιώματα* are in the building process what *φλοιώδη*, *ἄσμενα*, and *σχολικά* are in the process of literary composition, but grammatically they are the object, not the subject, of the verb, the subject being *μεγέθη*. If *μεγέθη* (massive stones, see Roberts, pp. 174-5) had been expressed by a masculine, the order might have remained awkward but the meaning would have been unambiguous.

Instead of saying, as he logically should have done: "What is trivial, superficial, or artificial spoils the whole work, as fissures and chinks spoil a building when they are left between massive stones that are put together in a wall," our author has said, less logically but not unnaturally: "Such things spoil a whole work, as massive stones that are being fitted into a wall spoil a whole edifice when they leave chinks and fissures as they are fitted together." *ταῦτα* refers to literary imperfections, the phrase *λυμαίνεται τὸ ὅλον* is to be understood in the second clause as applying to a building, its subject being *μεγέθη συνοικοδομούμενα* . . . (Manutius' *συνοικοδομούμενα* is good but not essential). For *ὡσανεί* with a participial clause compare 41, 3, where we read *ὡσανεί ἐπισυνδεδεμένα*. The confusing order may be due to the author not having his image clearly in mind from the beginning, and the chinks and fissures are mentioned first because they are the logical counterpart of *ταῦτα*. Such careless writing is more likely to happen when one is adapting a cliché to one's own use, and the comparison of words with stones in a wall or building does seem to have been a commonplace (e. g. Demetrius, *On Style*, 13).

VII

11, 1: *ὅταν δεχομένων τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ ἀγώνων κατὰ περιόδους ἀρχάς τε πολλὰς καὶ ἀναπαύλας ἕτερα ἐτέροις ἐπισκυκλούμενα μεγέθη συνεχῶς ἐπιδάγεται κατ' ἐπίβασιν*

40, 1: *καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν ταῖς περιόδοις ἑρπύς ἐστι πλήθους τὰ μεγέθη*

These are, surprisingly, the only two occurrences of the word *περίοδος* in the treatise. We would have expected some mention

of periods in the passages which discuss Demosthenes' use of hyperbaton (22), the beauties of melodious composition (39), the Marathon oath (16), and other figures. But it is the expression of ideas and the effect upon the audience which occupy Longinus' attention throughout. It is not only that the word is absent, but the whole subject of sentence-structure, so prominent in other critics, is passed over. Isocrates is criticized for a tendency to exaggeration (38, 1-2) and for his excessive use of connectives (21, 1), but the usual criticism of monotonously balanced clauses, though almost implied in the second passage, is not made. The figures most closely connected with sentence-structure, such as *parisosis* or *paromoiosis*, are not referred to. Our text is of course incomplete, but it does seem that Longinus is not thinking in terms of individual sentences, or is deliberately not discussing great writing in those terms.

Yet we have the two usages noted above; the phrases are awkward and restrictive if the word *περίοδος* is taken in the technical sense of 'period.' The first passage deals with amplification, and we should note that the expression *κατὰ περιόδους* occurs *within* the genitive absolute describing the circumstances under which amplification is used. To say "when the facts or the circumstances of the case permit many fresh starts and pauses *in the periods*" hardly makes sense, for there is no point at all in thus restricting the use of amplification to the periodic style, and in any case the *πράγματα* and *ἀγῶνες* are not in the periods. Yet 'in periods' is the usual translation (Boileau, Tollius, etc.; Prickard's "in periodic style" is open to the same objection, as is Lebègue's ambiguous "par périodes"). Weiske saw the difficulty: "Vertunt in periodis. Hoc res plane non patitur. *Περίοδος* potius est quod nos dicimus Abschnitt; caput vel pars libri in certo loco terminata." But this is surely an impossible translation, even though it is followed by Müller, Meinel, Roberts, and Fyfe ("from section to section").

The difficulty becomes very much less if we recognize that *περίοδος* is not here used in its technical literary sense at all. It means any kind of 'going around' and is frequently applied to periods of time. Lucian seems to use it of 'going round' the town, of 'periodic' visits from doctors, of intermittent fevers (*ἐκ περιόδου*, for references see *LSJ*). Though I can find no exact parallel, *κατὰ περιόδους* here too probably means 'from time

to time' and is especially suitable to the idea of the arguments going, as it were, round and round. So Tucker renders it, i. e. "time and time again," though his translation of the whole sentence is very free indeed. This gives very good sense: "Whenever the facts or circumstances of the case admit frequent fresh starts and pauses from time to time, and well rounded utterances succeed one another, each step increasing the effect." *μεγέθη* is not used for particular phrases or expressions, but rather refers, in a more general sense, to passages or utterances (see I above).

In 40, 1 the expression *ἐν ταῖς περιόδοις* is perhaps a trifle less embarrassing in the sense of periods, but here too *μεγάλα* and *μεγέθη* refer to something larger than words or expressions, for Longinus is thinking in larger terms than individual sentences. The accepted rendering is certainly awkward. Roberts translates: "and in periods sublimity is, as it were, a contribution made by a multitude." This is literal but obscure. Prickard's "one might put it that grand effects within a period contribute to a common fund of grandeur" ignores *πλήθους*, and no one explains why greatness or sublimity should be restricted to periods.

Here too the word is, I believe, used in a non-technical sense, and should be taken closely with *ἔρως*. In that context the going around would naturally be that of the courses at a feast or banquet, as it means the first 'course' in Xenophon, *Cyropaideia*, II, 2, 2: *καὶ ἤρξατο μὲν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὴν πρώτην περίοδον περιφέρων*, and in his *Symposium*, 4, 64: *αὕτη μὲν δὲ περίοδος τῶν λόγων*, it refers to a 'round' of conversation. *τὰ μεγέθη* means much the same as *τὰ ὕψη* when used with the article and refers to great passages or great utterances. Our author has just been extolling the virtues of rhythm in composition. The previous sentence compares scattered *μεγάλα* to the scattered limbs of the body which, when together, make a harmonious whole. This whole is, I think, more than a sentence; it is at least a great passage, perhaps even a whole work. Greatness is a combination of many factors. It is, one might say, like an *ἔρως* to which a multitude contributes as the banquet proceeds or the courses go round. We shall then translate: "Great things in literature are, one might say, like a feast to the courses of which a multitude contributes." The comparison with a banquet is also used by Demetrius (16).

VIII

35, 1-2: ἐπὶ μέντοι τοῦ Πλάτωνος καὶ ἄλλη τίς ἐστίν, ὡς ἔφην, διαφορά· οὐ γὰρ μεγέθει τῶν ἀρετῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ πλήθει πολὺν λειπόμενος ἀπονσίας, ὁ μὲν πλεῖον ἔτι τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασι περιττεύει ἢ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς λείπεται.

This is the MS text. All the editors, however, have adopted a conjecture of Manutius and read ὁ Λυσίας for ἀπονσίας, and most of them also follow Toup in reading ὅμως for ὁ μὲν, i. e. λειπόμενος, ὁ Λυσίας ὅμως. The resulting sense is startling in several respects.

The context is important: chapter 33 discusses the general proposition that genius, with all its faults, is to be preferred to flawlessness without genius. Chapter 34 gives an example of this; it lists the many virtues of Hyperides, most of which Demosthenes does not possess, but, in spite of this, Demosthenes, who has genius, is the greater writer. The sentence quoted above follows. In Demosthenes we saw the lack of particular virtues; it was not suggested that he had faults; the case of Plato, another writer of genius, shows, we are told, another difference. After the words quoted, Longinus proceeds immediately with the great passage on the noble nature of man and his place in the universe, the thing that the *ισόθεοι* of literature, the Platos and Demosthenes', see and make us feel.

How does the injection of Lysias fit into this context? The passage is usually translated to imply that Lysias is to Plato as Hyperides is to Demosthenes. This can be done, but it strains the Greek. Manutius' emendation arose from a recollection of 32, 8, which referred to Caecilius' preference of Lysias to Plato, but the discussion out of which that passage arose referred to *faults in Plato, not in Lysias*. Prickard's translation may be taken as representative:

"When we come to Plato, there is, as I said, another kind of preeminence. For Lysias, who is far below him in the number as well as in the magnitude of his good points, is yet more in excess of him in faults than in defect as to good points."

We may note in passing that there seems little point in comparing a lesser to a greater writer if he is inferior in everything, for this is no more than to say that a great writer is better than a lesser one. The comparison of Hyperides and Demosthenes was very different in its significance.

Apart from its pointlessness, the alleged criticism of Lysias is contrary to what we find in 32, 7-8, where Longinus admitted that it was *Plato's mistakes* which gave Caecilius some grounds (τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐλαττώμασιν ἐπιχείρων) for criticism. The faults of Plato were a commonplace of criticism, e. g. in Dionysius' *Letter to Pompey*, 1-2. And the whole subject of faulty genius as against flawless mediocrity arose from these faults in Plato as against the implied faultlessness of Lysias. Caecilius, however, drew the wrong conclusions, and 33-5 give the reasons why he was wrong.

Moreover, 'excess of faults,' which the accepted version of this passage attributes to Lysias, contradicts not only the point of the earlier comparison in this very treatise, but all that is said of Lysias by all ancient critics from Aristotle to Hermogenes, through Demetrius, Cicero, Dionysius, and Quintilian. Everywhere we find Lysias to be the master of the simple manner; he is praised for his charm, his *êthos*, his purity of diction, his felicities; such weaknesses as he possesses are not positive blemishes but the lack of certain qualities or virtues, namely those that go with the grand and forceful manner; in his own style he is supreme. The emendation of Manutius makes Longinus contradict not only himself, but every other critic as well.

The emendation also does violence to the text, for it requires us to translate οὐ γάρ . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ as if it were οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ, which it is not. Finally, the emendation has little to recommend it palaeographically. Apart from anything else, why should the simple ὁ Λυσίας ever have become ἀπονυσίας?

If then the emendation ὁ Λυσίας makes Longinus talk nonsense, if it complicates the text and requires not one emendation but three (including ὅμως), and it is inherently improbable, must we not in spite of the authority of Manutius and the complete unanimity with which he has been followed, reject it and look at the original reading afresh? The text is difficult, but once the incubus ὁ Λυσίας has been removed, it does become clearer, and the following considerations may, I hope, point towards a solution.

First, Plato only is being discussed, and is the subject of the whole sentence. The other *difference* which we are to find in his case must be weaknesses which are different from those we

found in Demosthenes but which are, like those of the great orator, obscured by the brilliance of his genius, for both writers are admittedly among the *ισόθελαι*. The first point is clearly that Plato is not inferior in the greatness of his virtues, and thus we take *οὐ γάρ* in its natural sense. Inferior to whom? Presumably to Demosthenes (that too was a commonplace by this time), or *λειπόμενος* may be taken as indicating weaknesses without direct comparison. "Plato is inferior, not in the greatness of his virtues but in the number of. . . ." Can we make sense of *ἀπουσίας*? It means, of course, the absence, the lack of something. Can it be the absence of his virtues? *τῷ πλήθει ἀπουσίας* (*sc. τῶν ἀρετῶν*) might then mean "the great number of times his virtues are absent." The sense is excellent, but the expression is difficult, especially perhaps because of the absence of the article before *ἀπουσίας*. For the sense of *ἀπουσία* we may compare Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.*, 3, 11 (1118 b 33): *τῷ μὴ λυπέσθαι τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ* (*sc. τῶν ἡδέων*), nor is a singular after *πλήθος* unusual, e. g. *διὰ πλήθος τῆς ζημίας* in Thuc., III, 70, 5, and we know that Greek writers in Roman times were not infrequently careless in the use of the article.

The *καί* of *ἀλλὰ καί* probably looks forward to *πλείον ἔτι* in the next clause, as if *καί . . . καί* had been intended, and the second replaced by a main clause. It points to the first of two weaknesses. The change of *ὁ μὲν* to *ὁμοῦς* is not required; *ὁ μὲν* without *δέ* is not unusual where a comparison is implied or expressed.

The sense of this fits into the context extremely well. "Now in the case of Plato there is still another difference, as I said (a reference to Plato's errors in 32, 7). For he is indeed inferior not in the greatness of his virtues but in the frequency of their absence; he is even more excessive in his faults than lacking in virtues." If this is the meaning of the passage Longinus is making a clear contrast: Demosthenes is a very great writer in spite of the fact that he lacks many virtues; Plato is also a very great writer in spite of different weaknesses, not so much the lack of virtues but the fact that these virtues are often absent, and even more because of positive blemishes.

That this is the general sense of the passage I have no doubt. The text may well be corrupt. A better interpretation than the one suggested above may well be found, but only if we recognize that Manutius' *ὁ Ἀυσίας* solves nothing, creates many difficulties

of sense and construction, and requires not one emendation but three.

IX

44, 9: ἄρα δὴ ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ λοιμικῇ τοῦ βίου διαφθορᾷ δοκοῦμεν ἐπὶ ἐλεύθερόν τινα κριτὴν τῶν μεγάλων ἢ διηκόντων πρὸς τὸν αἰῶνα κἀδέκαστον ἀπολελεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ καταρχαιρεσιάζεσθαι πρὸς τῆς τοῦ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐπιθυμίας;

It should be clear that κριτὴν is the subject of both ἀπολελεῖσθαι and καταρχαιρεσιάζεσθαι, yet our recent English translators do violence to the Greek by changing subjects between the two verbs. Prickard renders: "and that we are downright bribed by our desire to better ourselves." So Fyfe and apparently Roberts ("that all are influenced").

And even those translators who keep κριτὴν as the subject of both verbs (Tollius, Boileau, Weiske, Toup, Pearce, Hickie, Havell, Lebègue, Tucker, von Scheliha) miss the metaphor in καταρχαιρεσιάζεσθαι and translate as "to be corrupted." The word apparently occurs only here and in Plutarch's *Life of Gaius Gracchus* (11), where it is active and clearly means to defeat in an election, as Gracchus caused the defeat of Lucius Opimius by putting forward another candidate: τοῦ Γαίου τὸν Φάνιον προσαγάγοντος, ἐκείνον δὲ καταρχαιρεσιάζσαντος (cf. 8). That meaning is clearly recognized, but for our passage *LSJ* say s. v. "metaph. in Pass. to be corrupted as by office." This generally accepted meaning not only spoils the metaphor, but it is vapidly tautological to say: "Can we believe that there remains one incorruptible judge who is not corrupted?"

The meaning of the verb here is exactly the same as in Plutarch, and the metaphor has point. This Müller saw when he translated, without comment: ". . . und nicht niedergeschrien werde von der Wut der Plusmacherei," and Meinel's "und nicht von der Begierde nach Gewinn niedergestimmt werde" is even better. We should translate: "Can we believe that in this pestilence and corruption of life there is left any free uncorrupted judge of such great writing as will reach ages to come, who is not outvoted by those seeking their own advantage." The good judge will be defeated by the malpractices of selfishness as Opimius was by those of Gracchus, and his voice will not be heard.

THE ARCHONSHIP OF SYMMACHOS.

An Athenian inscription from the year of the archon Symmachos (188/7) has figured recently in discussions of the calendar character of the year,¹ and of the meeting places of the Athenian assembly.² The arguments depend largely on restoration in the opening lines of *I. G.*, II², 893. For the calendar the evidence allows no certain conclusion, and I shall touch that problem only lightly here. But there is some help for the meeting place of the assembly.

First of all, within the limits of our epigraphical knowledge, it is necessary to establish a sound text, for the text as published in the *Corpus* is not satisfactory.

After the first fifteen lines of fragment *a*, the text continues with twenty more lines on fragments *b* and *c*. Here Adolf Wilhelm has made a correction in lines 30-31 by giving the proper division:

[καὶ ἀνάθεσιν τῆς] στήλης μερίσ[αι τ]ὸ γερόμε-
[νον ἀνάλωμα τὸν ταμί]αν τῶν στρατιωτ[ικῶν].

His note was that in this inscription, as well as in one other with which he deals, "schliessen demnach alle Zeilen mit vollen Worten oder Silben."³

The principle of syllabic division at the ends of the lines is here perfectly sound, and Wilhelm's just claim for the application of it is illustrated in the text of the lines of fragment *a* which he published in 1914 and in which he corrected the inaccuracies which now have been perpetuated in *I. G.*, II², 893, at the ends of lines 4, 6, and 7. His suggestion for the original place of assembly, from which it had been moved to the theater, was ε[κ | τοῦ Κεραμεικοῦ]ῦ (?).⁴

Judgments of the amount of space available for restoration at the beginning of line 7 have differed widely, ranging from

¹ W. K. Pritchett and O. Neugebauer, *The Calendars of Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), pp. 29-30, 84-5.

² Chr. Pelekides, *R. E. G.*, LXIII (1950), pp. 110-12.

³ Πραγματεῖαι τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν, IV (1936), p. 17.

⁴ *Ath. Mitt.*, XXXIX (1914), pp. 295-7. This restoration is reported in *I. G.*, II², 893 (*Addenda*).

Wilhelm's estimate of twelve letters to Dow's estimate of nineteen: [ἐκ | τοῦ ἐμ Πειραιεῖ θεάτρο]υ.⁵ W. A. McDonald approves Dow's restoration, while rejecting that of Wilhelm. But he does not do full justice to the physical aspect of the problem in quoting Wilhelm as writing [ἐκ Κεραμεικο]ῦ when in fact he wrote ἐ[κ | τοῦ Κεραμεικο]ῦ(?). He is also unduly pessimistic about judging accurately the number of letter spaces to be filled, because "the width of the letters is irregular, and the stone is badly worn and broken at the left."⁶ There is less uncertainty than these statements might lead one to infer. Certainly the stone is not so badly broken that one cannot judge between twelve and nineteen letters to be supplied in a line where already nineteen are preserved. Wilhelm rejected the idea of restoring ἐ[κ | τοῦ Παναθηναϊκοῦ σταδίου]υ, which would have required twenty-one letters supplied at the beginning of line 7. This restoration was also rejected by Chr. Pelekides, in his study of the text, though in view of the uncertainties of spacing he was tempted to think that twenty-one letters would be not much worse than nineteen, and he finally settled for a restoration of thirteen letters. But he neglected syllabic division by writing ἐ[κ τ|οῦ Παναθηναϊκο]ῦ, and he made no examination of the stone (or, apparently, of a squeeze) so as to have an independent judgment on the disposition of the letters.⁷

No amount of written description can take the place of a drawing to show the arrangement of these lines of the prescript of *I. G.*, II², 893. I have come to the conclusion that Dow, whose judgment in these matters is expert, has been nearest right, and I give here a drawing made from the squeeze in the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton to show the preserved letters with the addition of the restorations as I would make them.

⁵ *Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil.*, XLVIII (1937), p. 111, note 3. Dow promises a proof of his restoration elsewhere, and adds that it "fits the space."

⁶ W. A. McDonald, *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks* (Baltimore, 1943), pp. 55-6, note 70.

⁷ *R. E. G.*, LXIII (1950), pp. 110-12.

Θ Ε Γ Ι Ε Μ Α Χ Ο Υ Α Ρ Χ Ο Ν Τ Ω Ε Γ Ι Τ Η Σ Α Ν Τ Ι Ο Χ Ι Δ Ο Σ Δ Ω
 Δ Ε Κ Α Τ Η Σ Γ Ρ Υ Τ Α Ν Ε Ι Α Σ Η Ι Α Ρ Χ Ι Κ Λ Η Σ Θ Ε Ο Δ Ω Ρ Ο Υ Θ Ο Ρ Ι
 Κ Ι Ο Σ Ε Γ Ρ Α Μ Μ Α Τ Ε Υ Ε Ν Σ Κ Ι Ρ Υ Ο Ρ Ι Ω Ν Ο Σ Ε Κ Τ Ε Ι Ε Γ Ι
 Δ Ε Κ Α Γ Γ Ε Μ Γ Τ Ε Ι Κ Α Ι Α Ε Κ Α Τ Ε Ι Τ Η Σ Γ Ρ Υ Τ Α Ν Ε Ι Α Σ Ε Ο Υ Α Ν
 Κ Α Ι Ε Κ Κ Α Η Σ Ι Α Ε Ν Τ Ω Ι Ο Ε Α Τ Ρ Ω Ι Μ Ε Τ Α Χ Θ Ε Ι Σ Α Ε Κ
 Γ Α Ν Α Θ Η Ν Α Ι Κ Ο Υ Σ Τ Α Δ Ι Ο Υ Τ Ω Ν Γ Ρ Ο Ε Δ Ρ Ω Ν Ε Γ Ε Υ Η Φ Ι
 Η Ε Ν
 Γ Ρ Ο Ε Α Ρ Ο Ι Ε Δ Ο Ε Ε Ν Τ Η Β Ο Υ Λ Ε Ι Κ Α Ι Τ Ω Ι Δ Η Μ Ω Ι
 Α Ρ Χ Ο Σ Τ Ι Μ Ω Μ Ε Ν Ο Σ Υ Π Ο Τ Ο Υ Β Α Σ Ι Λ Ε Ω Σ Γ Τ Ο Λ Ε
 Μ Α Ι Ο Υ Φ Ι Α Ο Σ Τ Ε Κ Α Ι Ε Υ Ν Ο Υ Σ Ω Ν Β Α Ι Α Τ Δ Ε Ι Τ Ω Ι Δ Η
 Μ Ω Ι Τ Ω Ι Α Θ Η Ν Α Ι Ω Ν Κ Α Ι Κ Ο Ι Ν Η Ι Κ Α Ι Κ Α Θ Ι Δ Ι Α Ν Α
 Γ Γ Ο Δ Ε Ι Κ Ν Υ Τ Α Ι Ε Μ Γ Α Σ Ι Κ Α Ι Ρ Ο Ι Σ Τ Η Ν Σ Γ Ο Υ Δ Η Ν
 Ο Τ Ο Υ Α

a. 188/7 a.

I. G., II², 893a

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. ca. 35-39

- [^θ ^ε]
 [ἐπὶ Συμμάχου ἄρχο]ν[το]ς [ἐ]πὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος δω
 [δεκάτης πρυτανείας ἢ Ἀρ]χικλῆς Θεοδώρου Θορί
 [κιος ἐγραμμάτευν· Σκιρ]οφοριῶνος ἔκτει ἐπὶ ν
 5 [δέκα, πέμπτει καὶ δεκάτ]ει τῆς πρυτανείας· [βου]λῇ
 [καὶ ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ] θεάτρῳ μεταχθε[ι]σα ἐκ ν
 [Παναθηναϊκοῦ σταδίου]ν· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφι
 [ζεν --- ^{ca. 15} ---]ωνος Ῥαμνούσιος καὶ συμ
 [πρόεδροι νυνν ἔδοξεν] τῇ βουλευί καὶ τῷ δήμῳ·
 10 [--- ^{ca. 16} ---] Λαμ]πρεὺς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ ν
 [. . . ἀρχος τιμώμενος ὑπὸ το]ῦ βασιλέως Πτολε
 [μαίου φίλος τε καὶ εὐνὸς ὦν] διατε[λ]εῖ τῷ δῇ ν
 [μῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων καὶ κοινῇ καὶ κα]θ' ἰδίαν α
 [ποδείκνυται ἐμ πᾶσι καιροῖς τὴν σ]πουδὴν ν
 15 [---] ὅτου α[ν]
 [---]

V. 2 N et Σ verbi [ἄρχο]ν[το]ς non vidi; legit Lolling.

V. 5 fin. ΛΗ non vidi; legit Lolling. V. 6 fin. Meritt.

V. 12 διατε[λ]εῖ Meritt. V. 13 fin. A leg. Meritt. V. 15 Lolling et Meritt.

It is evident that lengths of line can be determined at least with approximate exactitude. The name and patronymic of the chairman of the proedroi had not fifteen letters, but more nearly nineteen (line 8); there were about four uninscribed spaces before ἔδοξεν in line 9;⁸ the name and patronymic in line 10 have been correctly restored with about fifteen (I should prefer sixteen) letters; a slight correction must be made by adding τε in line 12; and an extra letter *alpha* is read at the end of line 13. This extra letter leads to a tentative restoration of line 14. There were clearly uninscribed spaces at the ends of lines 4, 6, 10, 12, and 14.

With the traditional restoration [ἐκκ]λη|[σία] in lines 5-6, one might suggest as a complete restoration for the place of assembly (lines 5-7):

[ἐκκ]λη
 [σία σύγκλητος ἐν τῷ] θεάτρῳ μεταχθε[ι]σα ἐκ ν
 [Παναθηναϊκοῦ σταδίου]ν

Indeed this is most tempting, but it is probably to be rejected,

⁸ The restoration of line 9 with no uninscribed spaces may indeed have been the misleading cause for the general assumption of too few letters all the way from line 5 to line 9.

none the less, because we have no attested instance (so far as I am now aware) of a meeting of the assembly beginning in the Panathenaic stadion.⁹ There is evidence for meetings of the Council in the Panathenaic stadion,¹⁰ and for meetings of the Council which began there and were transferred elsewhere.¹¹ There is also evidence for meetings of the Council followed by meetings of the assembly in the theater. The most significant example (because it is of approximately the same date as *I. G.*, II², 893) is *I. G.*, II², 897, line 4, of 185/4 B. C.: βουλὴ ἐμ βουλευτηρίῳ σύγκλητος στρατ[ηγῶν] παραγγελάντων καὶ ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία [κυρία] ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ. This formula must be considered, because of the possibility of restoring [βου]λή at the end of line 5 in *I. G.*, II², 893.¹²

Though it would be possible to restore

[ἐκκ]λή

[σία ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐν τῷ] θεάτρῳ μεταχθε[ῖ]σα ἐκ ν
[Παναθηναϊκοῦ σταδίου]ν

a better order of words is achieved by reading

[βου]λή

[καὶ ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ] θεάτρῳ μεταχθε[ῖ]σα ἐκ ν
[Παναθηναϊκοῦ σταδίου]ν,

this being an abbreviated form (with consequent differences of constitutional interpretation) of the phraseology employed in *I. G.*, II², 897, probably implying that the deliberations had been begun with a meeting of the Council in the Panathenaic stadion and concluded with a meeting of the Assembly in the theater. The formulae of resolution are identical in *I. G.*, II², 893 and 897: [ἔδοξεν] τῇ βουλευεῖ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ and [ἔδοξεν] τεῖ βουλευεῖ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.

⁹ See W. A. McDonald, *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks*, pp. 44-61.

¹⁰ Pritchett and Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940), p. 114. This decree was also passed in the twelfth prytany.

¹¹ *I. G.*, II², 1043, lines 4-5.

¹² Chr. Pelekides, *R. E. G.*, LXIII (1950), p. 112, note 2, has been too hasty in writing: La restitution du mot [βου]λή, possible théorique-ment, à la place de [ἐκκ]λή|[σία κυρία ἐν τῷ] θεάτρῳ etc. ne conduit à rien. The stone is quite worn at the end of line 5. An examination by Vanderpool has given no evidence for deciding between [βου]λή and [ἐκκ]λή|[σία].

The normal formula is βουλὴ ἐν τῷ Παναθηναϊκῷ σταδίῳ or βουλὴ ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ ἢ μεταχθεῖσα ἐκ τοῦ Παναθηναϊκοῦ σταδίου, *vel sim.*; i. e., the definite article is used in the phrase ἐκ τοῦ Παναθηναϊκοῦ σταδίου. I have not so restored it in the present text, for Wilhelm and Pelekides were right in claiming that it makes too long a line. But it is not necessary in this inscription where the definite article was also omitted before μεταχθε[ῖ]σα: witness to a mannerism in writing which in all probability is equally valid for the omission of the article before [Παναθηναϊκοῦ σταδίου]ν. With a slightly different text from that of Pelekides, we thus arrive at agreement with him as to the place where the assembly was held, and we obtain a better disposition of the opening lines of the inscription.

The calendar equation of lines 4-5 is appropriate for an ordinary year in which the last prytany had one less day than the month of Skirophorion. But a restoration of the date (e. g.) as Prytany XII, 18, is not impossible—the spacing of letters cannot be held to such strict account as not to allow here the variation of one space between πέμπτει and ὀγδόει—and those who have held that the year of Symmachos was intercalary have so interpreted it.

There are now five equations which illustrate the calendar character of the year of Symmachos.¹³ Of these I believe that the above text favors slightly an ordinary year, but more particularly I believe that Pritchett and Neugebauer have made a good case that *I. G.*, II², 892, demands an ordinary year. This is certainly true if count of days in the last decade of a month was backward with μετ' εἰκάδας and if the calendar equation of *I. G.*, II², 892, is valid: [Μου]νιχιῶ[ρο]ς δευτέραι μετ' [εἰκάδας, ἐνάτει] καὶ εἰ[κ]οστῇ τῆς πρυτανε[ίας]. The prytany is known as the tenth. Here the twenty-ninth day of the month was the same as the twenty-ninth day of the prytany and months and prytanies at this point in the year were in perfect accord. There is a slight maladjustment in the correspondences between months and prytanies in the text published in *Hesperia*, XV (1946), pp. 144-6, no. 6. The equation there shows that the 18th day of some month was the same as the 21st day of some prytany: a discrepancy of three days. Pritchett and Neugebauer take note

¹³ Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars*, pp. 29-30.

of this and still hold to their conviction of an ordinary year. But there is a greater discrepancy, one of six or seven days, in the equation of *I. G.*, II², 891. As given in the *Corpus* the text reads: [Μουνιχιῶνος ἐνδε]κάτει, ὀγδόει καὶ δεκάτει τῆς πρυ[τανείας].

There is, of course, no reason for believing that the month was Mounichion unless one wants to hold to an intercalary year and assume an irregular forward count with μετ' εἰκάδας in *I. G.*, II², 892. Believing in an ordinary year, one can only assume that the civil calendar was chaotic; and this is the assumption that Pritchett and Neugebauer have made.

Much depends on the correct reading of the stone. One may now state categorically that the date by month is not [ἐνδε]κάτει, but rather [ἐ]νάτει. This has been verified by Eugene Vanderpool and Markellos Mitsos in Athens, and I have seen the first preserved letter plainly on the excellent latex squeeze sent to me by Vanderpool. All three strokes of the nu are clear: the letter is nu; it can have been only nu, nothing else.¹⁴

Inasmuch as any date by month simply with [ἐ]νάτει is impossible, it is evident that there has been an omission on the part of the stonecutter, either ἵσταμένον or ἐπὶ δέκα or μετ' εἰκάδας; and since the year was ordinary the words omitted were undoubtedly ἐπὶ δέκα.¹⁵ The restoration of the date by month, therefore, corresponds within one day with the date by prytany, and argues a calendar less chaotic than that proposed in the latest study of these inscriptions.¹⁶

BENJAMIN D. MERITT.

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY.

¹⁴ Uncertainty, or false certainty, over the reading of this letter has had a long history: Tsountas, *Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.*, 1885, p. 141; Koehler, *Ath. Mitt.*, V (1880), p. 327; Koehler, on *I. G.*, II, 5, 417 b; Wilhelm, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXXIX (1914), p. 296.

¹⁵ This was, in effect, Koehler's solution of the problem in *I. G.*, II, 5, 417 b, which was rejected by Wilhelm (*loc. cit.* in preceding note).

¹⁶ The month could be Mounichion if the date in *I. G.*, II², 892 be taken as Pryt. X, 28 rather than Pryt. X, 29. In view of the dislocation of days in the early months evidenced in *Hesperia*, XV (1946), pp. 144-6, no. 6, it is probable that *I. G.*, II², 891 belongs to the latter part of the year. It could be restored as of the twelfth prytany and of Skirophorion along with *I. G.*, II², 893 (see above, p. 380), but no particular month and prytany are sure.

AENEID III AND THE AENEAS LEGEND.*

In a recent article¹ we undertook a re-examination of the structure of book III of Vergil's *Aeneid*, which demonstrated two points contrary to the general attitude of scholars regarding the book:

- 1) that it was conceived and executed with meticulous care;
- 2) that its structure was not only consonant with the other books of the poem, but actually established the pattern for the design of books I-VI as a unit.

It is the intention of the present paper to consider further one important aspect in the composition of the book: i. e., the relationship of the material presented here to the body of previously existing legendary material concerning Aeneas' wanderings from Troy to Drepanum and to explore to what extent the structure of *Aeneid* III was determined by the state of the Aeneas legend at the time Vergil wrote.

Our knowledge of the state of the Aeneas legend in the first century B. C. is, of course, imperfect; but a monumental job of collecting all of the material relating to the legend has been performed by Jacques Perret.² From Perret's work it is abundantly clear that the legend had not by Vergil's time crystallized into a single form and on many points authorities differed most widely. Acknowledging our debt to Perret, we can list the following locations as having figured in one or more of the various traditions concerning Aeneas' wanderings over the area covered by *Aeneid* III:

* With the support of a grant from the Penrose Fund of the American Philosophical Society.

¹ "Aeneid III: A New Approach," *A. J. P.*, LXXVIII (1957), pp. 133-51. Cf. W. H. Semple, "A Short Study of Aeneid, Book III," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XXXVIII (1955), pp. 225-40, which has since come to my attention.

² *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome* (Paris, 1942).

I. Thrace: Aeneia or Aenos	IX. Leucas
II. Samothrace	X. Actium
III. Delos	XI. Ambracia
IV. Arcadia	XII. Dodona
[V. Aphrodisias and Etis]	XIII. Buthrotum
VI. Cythera	XIV. Onchesmos
VII. Cape Cinaethion	XV. Castrum Minervae
VIII. Zacynthos	XVI. Lacinium
	XVII. Drepanum (Elymus, Egesta)

We can be sure that each of the above communities (with the possible exception of V) figured in one or more traditions concerning the wanderings of Aeneas anterior to the writing of the *Aeneid*. The fragmentary state of our evidence would make it hazardous to assume that the list is complete. It is less hazardous to suppose that, since these are stops which sources that are to a large extent secondary saw fit to record, Vergil was well aware of their rôle in the legend.

The tradition, however, was richer than a simple listing of a series of ports of call. Certain legends had also become current concerning the happenings of the Aeneadae en route. The problem here is more complex, but in outline the following was related in connection with the various stops:

I. In a region of Thrace occupied by a people (the Crusaean according to Dionysius) who had been allied to the Trojans during the war, they were hospitably received. While there they built a temple to Aphrodite and founded a city (Aeneia³ or Aenos⁴) where they left behind those who were too fatigued to continue.⁵ In some versions Aeneas died here;⁶ in others it was Anchises.⁷

³ Hellanicus *apud* Dion. Hal., I, 47, 6; Hegesippus and Hegesianax *apud* Dion. Hal., I, 49, 1; Lycophron, 1236; Livy, I, 1, 4, cf. XL, 4, 9; Strabo, XIII, 608; Steph. Byz., s. v.

⁴ Mela, II, 28; Schol. Lycophron, 1236. These two sites are obviously confused; see Perret, pp. 20 ff. The confusion doubtlessly arose from the fact that Aeneia, the original localization, was no longer in Thrace proper, but Macedonia.

⁵ Dion. Hal., I, 49, 4. Dionysius' discourse on the wanderings of Aeneas (I, 49-53) seems to come principally from Varro. See Perret, pp. 582 ff.

⁶ Hegesippus and Hegesianax, *loc. cit.*

⁷ Theon *apud* Steph. Byz., *loc. cit.*

II. In Samothrace Aeneas dedicated the shield of Abas to the great gods.⁸ There was a tradition connecting the great gods of the Samothracians with the Roman Penates⁹ and according to some Aeneas brought them directly from Samothrace.¹⁰ One version has the Aeneadae joined by a certain Saon who later introduced the Salian dances to the future Romans.¹¹

III. The Trojans came to Delos in the reign of king Anius. According to some versions he had a daughter Lavinia, a prophetess and seer, who accompanied the Aeneadae to Italy.¹²

IV. The Aeneadae reached Orchomenus (nicknamed "Nessos"), an inland city of Arcadia. While there they built the town Capys, named for Capys.¹³ The Trojans were related to the Arcadians through Dardanus, who by one tradition came from there.¹⁴ They appear to have stayed a time here: Aeneas married off a couple of daughters¹⁵ and a further tradition related Anchises' death here.¹⁶ One account has the Aeneadae joined by Salius, a Mantinean, and it was he who introduced the dances of the Salii (cf. II above).¹⁷

V. Aeneas was driven into the bay of Boiae by storms and there founded Aphrodisias and Etis. The latter was named for a daughter Etias.¹⁸

VI.¹⁹ At Cythera they built a temple to Aphrodite.

VII. A brief stop is made at a promontory for the burial of

⁸ Servius *ad Aen.* III, 287.

⁹ See Dion. Hal., I, 68 f., and cf. R. B. Lloyd, "*Penatibus et Magnis Dis*," *A. J. P.*, LXXVII (1956), pp. 41 ff.

¹⁰ Servius *ad Aen.* III, 12, 287; VII, 207; VIII, 679.

¹¹ Critolaus *apud* Festus, s. v. "Salios" (Lindsay, pp. 438 f.).

¹² Dion. Hal., I, 50, 1 and 59, 3.

¹³ Ariaithos and Agathyllos *apud* Dion. Hal., I, 49, 1 f.; Strabo, *loc. cit.*

¹⁴ See Dion. Hal., I, 61 and 68.

¹⁵ Dion. Hal., I, 54, 2.

¹⁶ Pausanias, VIII, 12, 8.

¹⁷ Polemon *apud* Festus, *loc. cit.*

¹⁸ Pausanias, III, 22, 11 and cf. VIII, 12, 8. Perret considers this tradition post Vergilian (see pp. 44 ff.). He discusses these localizations before Arcadia; but if Curtius' (*Peloponnesos*, Vol. II, Taf. IX) location of these cities (northeast of the Malea promontory) is correct, they would have been reached immediately before or after Cythera.

¹⁹ Dion. Hal., I, 50 f., is the source for stops VII-XVI.

one of Aeneas' companions, Cinaethus, who gave his name to the place, Cape Cinaethion.²⁰

VIII. At Zacynthos they were hospitably received by reason of ancient kinship (Zacynthos, the founder of the community, was a son of Dardanus). The visit was extended because of bad weather. While there they built a temple to Aphrodite and instituted a traditional sacrifice and games. The latter featured a foot-race along a course known as the *dromos* of Aeneas and Aphrodite, which ended up at the temple. Wooden statues of both Aphrodite and Aeneas suggest a heroön in addition to the temple.

IX. At Leucas they built a temple of Aphrodite Aeneias on a small island (probably between the large island and the mainland of Acarnania).

X. They approached Actium and came to anchor at the promontory. A temple of Aphrodite and another to the great gods mark their visit.

XI. They came to Ambracia in the reign of Ambrax, a grandson of Heracles. Here they dedicated another temple to Aphrodite Aeneias and a heroön to Aeneas. Within the latter was a wooden statue, purportedly of Aeneas, which later was honored with sacrifices conducted by special priestesses.

XII. At this point the Trojans split up. One group, Aeneas and the most stalwart of his crew, marched by land to consult the oracle at Dodona. Here they encounter a group of Trojans settled in the region under Helenus.²¹ They receive a prophecy concerning their own settlement; the details are unclear, but it included a forecast of famine and the eating of tables.²² They

²⁰ Curtius, *loc. cit.*, places this a short distance up the west coast from Taenaron.

²¹ We have here what appears to be a yoking with a separate tradition of a Trojan settlement in Epirus. See Euripides, *Andromache*, 1243 ff., *et schol. ad* 1245; cf. Pausanias, I, 11, 1, and Servius *ad Aen.* III, 335. See also Perret, pp. 216 ff.

²² According to Varro (*apud* Servius *ad Aen.* III, 256) the prophecy was given here. Others say it was delivered by the Idaean Sibyl (Dion. Hal., I, 55, 4). There was also a tradition that Anchises learned it from Venus (*Orig. Gent. Rom.*, XI, 1; cf. Morel, *F. P. L.*, Naevius frg. 13a and H. T. Rowell, "The Scholium on Naevius in *Parisinus Latinus*

subsequently presented inscribed bronze craters and other offerings to the god. They proceeded by land (about four days' march) to join the rest of the group at Buthrotum.

XIII. The second group with Anchises as their leader sailed directly from Ambracia to Buthrotum. The place of their encampment there was called "Troy."²³

XIV. They put in at the Harbor of Anchises (Onchesmos) where they built a temple to Aphrodite. There was a tradition of Anchises' death here which accounted for the name.²⁴

XV. They crossed the Ionian Gulf, guided in their journey by a certain Patron of Thyrium in Acarnania²⁵ and some of his countrymen. Some of these eventually returned home, but some, including Patron, joined the company of the Aeneadae. They landed at two different points in Southern Italy: most of them, at the Iapygian Promontory (Sallentinum); but Aeneas, at Castrum Minervae and its harbor, thereafter known as the Port of Venus. Servius reports from Varro²⁶ an encounter with Diomedes in Calabria, at which time the Greek hero returned to Aeneas the Palladium and the bones of his father which he had dug up (a version obviously presupposing the death of Anchises, probably at Onchesmos).²⁷ The reason for

7930," *A. J. P.*, LXXVIII [1957], pp. 15 ff.). See also Lycophron, 1250 ff., *et schol. ad loc.*; Strabo, *loc. cit.*; Cassius Dio (Melber), frg. 3, 3.

²³ Varro *apud* Servius *ad Aen.* III, 349.

²⁴ Procopius, VIII, 22, 31.

²⁵ It is not necessary to postulate from this that a separate stop of the Aeneadae at Thyrium occupied a place in the tradition.

²⁶ *Ad Aen.* II, 166; III, 407; IV, 427; V, 81.

²⁷ Perret rejects this whole episode as misplaced by Servius, having originally been located by Varro after the landing in Latium. According to tradition Diomedes wandered widely after returning home to find his wife faithless, and can be localized as close to Onchesmos as Coreyra (Heraclides [Rose], fr. 56). Finally he came to Apulia and there married the daughter of king Daunus (see Roscher's *Lexikon*, s. v.). Perret finds it hard to suppose an account where Diomedes could have dug up the bones of Anchises and made his way across the Ionian Sea in time to encounter Aeneas in Calabria. This is certainly difficult within the chronological limit of two years for the entire journey from Troy to Lavinium, set as early as Hemina (Peter, fr. 7), which Perret (p. 594; cf. 545 ff.) assumes from Dion. Hal., I, 63, to have been followed by Varro. The crux of the matter lies in the fact that the story

Diomedes' magnanimity was a certain oracle which indicated that his misfortune would not ameliorate until he did.

XVI. Passing along the coast toward Sicily, they stopped and dedicated a bronze patera at the temple of Juno (at Lacinium).

XVII. In Sicily, possibly thrown off their course by tempests, they landed at Drepanum.²⁸ Here they met another band of Trojans who, under Elymus and Aegestus, had preceded the Aeneadae in their departure from Troy. These had settled at the river Crimisis among the Sicani who treated them hospitably because of kinship (Aegestus had been born and brought up in Sicily). While here Aeneas built two towns, Aegesta (= Segesta) and Elyma.²⁹ At the latter Aeneas erected a shrine to Aphrodite and at the former a shrine to Aeneas was put up after his departure. Aeneas left segments of his troops in these towns. Some say that this was done to relieve the weary of the necessity of following, but according to others the unhappy women set fire to the ships, destroying a part of the fleet and necessitating that some remain behind. Lilybaeum is also mentioned as a stopping place of the Aeneadae.³⁰

Such, in skeleton form at least, was the substance of the legend concerning the wanderings of Aeneas from Troy to Drepanum prior to Vergil. A more complete knowledge than is at our disposal would certainly add the meat of some detail about these various episodes and perhaps a few more stops to the list, but not basically alter the character of what we have left. Against this background, fragmentary though it may be,

of Aeneas' wanderings had grown considerably between Hemina and the late first century B.C. It is hard to imagine all of the activity which the tradition records—the founding of cities, shrines, etc.—taking place in two years. Vergil adjusted the chronology and the present author assumes that he was not the first. There is perhaps an allusion to this tradition in *Aen.* IV, 427, but cf. A. E. Raymond, "What was Anchises' Ghost to Dido," *Phoenix*, VI (1952), pp. 66-8.

²⁸ Dion. Hal., I, 52 f.; cf. Thucydides, VI, 2, 3; Cicero, *Verr.* II, iv, 72; Strabo, *loc. cit.*; Solinus, II, 14. Perret rejects the *Tabula Iliaca* as unauthentic for any early tradition regarding Aeneas' arrival in Sicily or Italy (pp. 84 ff.).

²⁹ Usually identified with Eryx. See E. Cary's edition of Dion. Hal. (Loeb), vol. I, p. 172, note 3, and Perret, p. 82, note 2.

³⁰ Strabo, *loc. cit.*; a curious anachronism as Perret (p. 84, note 1) has pointed out.

we can well afford to examine the substance of *Aeneid* III and in the process ascertain what we can of the workmanship of Vergil.

"Seldom has a great poet had a less promising subject to deal with than Vergil when he undertook to write the *Aeneid*." The truth of these words of Henry Nettleship is nowhere more apparent than as applied to Vergil's task in book III. The problem was to extract from tradition a version to be molded into an artistic unit which would at once be conformable to legendary history and to a design for the epic as a whole. To be sure, the very nature of the legend and particularly that part concerning the wanderings of the Aeneadae, was a dominant factor in the formulation of a design for the first six books of the epic. The tradition itself was suggestive of a series of stops at various ports of call in the Mediterranean with incidents of greater and lesser import related along the way. Such a general design, as we have discussed previously,³¹ is basic to the structure of book III as well as the first half of the poem.

The great need, however, was for a central theme through which the various incidents could be related and by centralization avoid a structure which was disjointedly episodic. Vergil's choice of progressive divine revelations to Aeneas of his destiny was a happy one, for it not only supplied this need but also helped solve a crucial problem of a different order: the revitalizing of this "ancient" account for his contemporaries and for many generations to come. This he in large measure accomplished by means of what might be termed "illusional projection": backward, in a manner traditional to Roman history and epic since Cato, by the tracing of current institutions into the legendary past; and forward, by a series of prophecies which look from legendary past to present and beyond. Both aspects of this illusional projection Vergil derived from the legend itself, but in different degrees. The retracing of political, religious, or social institutions into the legendary period is central to almost every episode of the tradition: the Aeneadae repeatedly found cities, build shrines, initiate practices, etc., "which still exist today." This is hardly to be wondered at, for it was this desire to glorify Rome's past in terms of the

³¹ See note 1.

Greek world which gave impetus to the growth of the Aeneas legend (and incidentally gave birth to Roman historiography) in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B. C.³²

The rôle of prophecy in the legend of the wanderings is decidedly less significant. The important prophecies of tradition concerning Aeneas are localized in the Troad (the Sibyl of Mount Ida) before his departure and in Italy (the miraculous springs, the sow, etc.)³³ after his arrival. In the traditional passage from Troy to Drepanum there are at most two prophetic incidents for the Aeneadae. These occur at Delos and Dodona, places which would naturally suggest something of the sort. At Delos the daughter of Anius joins them, obviously because of her prophetic powers, but in our fragment at least she does not display her gifts. The only true prophecy is received from the oracle at Dodona, which the Aeneadae go out of their way to consult. They are told something of their destination and according to Varro the prediction of the eating of tables is given here. Some versions, however, ascribe this to the Idaean Sibyl.

Vergil's procedure was to reverse the importance of these two elements. He has made successive omen and prophecy the combining ingredient of the whole series of stops and basic to the structure, as we have seen, not only of book III but of the unit I-VI as a whole. The tracing back of Roman institutions for Vergil is more incidental, although he hasn't the slightest hesitation about including a non-prophetic stop, Actium, for seemingly no other purpose but to supply a glorious past for Augustan institutions.

A degree of unity was likewise to be obtained by limiting the number of stops. A first glance will show that Vergil has done a considerable amount of telescoping of the legend in this respect and at the same time has found room for a considerable amount of original material. We are ready to examine more precisely what Vergil has done in book III in relationship to what can be

³² The origin of the legend is certainly much earlier than Perret's date (the period of the Pyrrhic Wars), but he is correct to the extent that the legend did not flower until Rome's serious expansion into the Greek world.

³³ Dion. Hal., I, 55 f. It should be remarked, of course, that the history of the Aeneas legend begins with the prophecy of Poseidon in *Iliad*, XX, 307 ff.

reconstructed of the traditions concerning Aeneas' wanderings. This can perhaps best be done under three headings:

- I. The traditional stops "sacrificed" by Vergil.
- II. The traditional stops employed by Vergil.
- III. The stops original with Vergil.

I

We have previously seen how book III can be divided into nine major episodes: I) Thrace; II) Delos; III) Crete; IV) the Strophades; V) Actium; VI) Buthrotum; VII) the passage from Epirus to Italy; VIII) Scylla and Charybdis and IX) the Cyclops. This list by itself, when compared with the many stops of the tradition, will reveal the extent of the abbreviation. Vergil has here nominally made use of only the stops at Thrace, Delos, Actium, Buthrotum, and Castrum Minervae. Drepanum receives only passing mention in book III; it is reserved for a fuller episode in the return visit of the Aeneadae in book V. To what extent were the remaining stops ignored?

Samothrace was omitted for the obvious reason that it would have involved conflicting versions of the legend. Since Vergil followed a tradition that the Penates were brought by Aeneas from Troy and not from Samothrace, the inclusion of a stop at the latter place might have proved embarrassing. It is worthy of note, however, that Vergil has not forsaken the dedication of the shield of Abas, but simply transferred this event to Actium.

Wanderings of the Aeneadae in the inland of Arcadia present a rather serious problem in a legend of a seagoing people. Perret (pp. 38 ff.) feels that even Dionysius is uncomfortable narrating them. It must be acknowledged that marches inland at this point are not really intelligible unless the stops in Arcadia are conceived as final. The tradition of the marriage of Aeneas' daughters and the death of Anchises here would suggest either such a finality or at least a visit of some extent. At any rate Vergil's reasons for excluding such a stop are obvious enough: 1) the visit is not sufficiently motivated, not to say completely illogical and 2) the traditions relating to the stop (e. g. Anchises' death) are irreconcilable with the version of the legend which the *Aeneid* was to embrace.

Aphrodisias, Etis, Cythera, and Cinaethion were probably omitted for a single reason. The founding of cities, building of temples to Aphrodite, and naming of places after deceased Trojans present the most monotonous aspect of the legend in its traditional form. It is a monotony of which Vergil makes good use to establish a mood of essential weariness on the part of the Aeneadae, but stops where nothing was recorded except the founding of a city or the building of a temple were the most likely to be excluded in Vergil's economizing account. As for the use of eponymous characters, Vergil reserves them for Italy and locales of greater significance for his audience.³⁴

Zacynthos, Leucas, and Ambracia have not really been sacrificed but, as we have tried to show elsewhere,³⁵ were combined and incorporated into a single stop at Actium. Most significant here is the removal of the Zacynthian games to this site in order to supply an ancient precedent for the Actian games of Augustus. In a similar way Dodona has not been omitted, but combined with Buthrotum. By placing the whole scene in the vicinity of Buthrotum, Vergil perhaps loses the august site of Dodona, but as before cautiously avoids a cumbersome and unmotivated inland trip.

The passage over the Ionian Gulf in book III is from Acrocerania rather than Onchesmos, obviously to avoid the traditional association of the "Harbor of Anchises" with his death there. Lacinium is not totally ignored, but receives only passing mention as the Aeneadae sail along the coast.

We can conclude with regard to the omission of traditional stops that they have often not been truly sacrificed, but combined with others, either by a telescoping of events in a geographical proximity, or by transferring the traditions of one stop to another. The poet's reasons for combining or omitting stops are clear: 1) to avoid diametrically opposed traditions; 2) to avoid unmotivated excursions over land; 3) to avoid excessive repetition of similar events.

³⁴ E.g., Misenus (VI, 234); Palinurus (VI, 381); Caieta (VII, 2), etc.

³⁵ "On *Aeneid*, III, 270-280," *A. J. P.*, LXXV (1954), pp. 293 ff.

II

Vergil has chosen five of the traditional landing places of the Aeneadae as sites for major episodes of book III: Thrace, Delos, Actium, Buthrotum, and Castrum Minervae. Since, as we have seen, the series of stops is united around a central theme of divine revelation, the sites of Delos and Buthrotum-Dodona were most readily adaptable to the poet's design and purpose. Delos as *urbs Apollinis*, where Anius is not only king but priest of Phoebus, is immediately suggestive of an oracular consultation, although the tradition (what can be reconstructed of it, at least) was devoid of such a specific episode. The result is hardly satisfactory for the Aeneadae: the response, *antiquam exquirite matrem*, proves fatally cryptic. For geographical reasons Delos must occur rather early in the wanderings and at this point in the story the poet cannot afford to make the oracle too direct. There is no question, however, of a prophetic daughter of Anius to join their group; a prophetess or seer in their midst would seriously have interfered with Vergil's plans for the development of the character of Anchises in this direction.³⁶

Buthrotum, as combined with Dodona, was for many reasons suited for development as the scene of the fullest and the clearest revelation the Trojans receive in the book, and in general to occupy the place of central importance in the journey from Troy to Drepanum. Tradition had recorded at Dodona³⁷ a prophecy concerning the eventual settlement of the Aeneadae. The site was far enough along the route, moreover, so that the response could be fairly direct. But most important of all for the poet, legend older than Euripides, i. e. that concerning Helenus and Andromache, made this stop mythologically the most interesting of the traditional series. Vergil makes it at once the poetic and structural climax of the book. Removing the scene from Dodona, he has placed it in the vicinity of Buthrotum, where the traditional encampment of the Trojans, "Troy," becomes the city of Helenus modelled on its ill-fated predecessor. The episode is a dramatic *coup*, providing as it does a larger framework for the action of book III. It looks at once backward (particularly

³⁶ Lloyd, *op. cit.* (note 1 above), pp. 9 ff., and 14 f.

³⁷ Note among Helenus' gifts to Aeneas *Dodonaeos lebetas*; cf. F. Norwood, "The Tripartite Eschatology of *Aeneid* 6," *C.P.*, XLIX (1954), p. 25.

in the figure of Andromache) to the tragedy of the Trojan conflict, and at the same time forward optimistically (in the figure of Helenus, first in his present prosperity and then in the details of his prophecy) to the eventual rehabilitation of the remnants of the Trojan people and their future glories in Italy.

The landing at Aeneia in Thrace is one of the oldest localizations of the Aeneadae outside of the Troad, going back at least to Hellenicus. Certainly this fact, combined with its heading the list of traditional stops, made it essential to any account of Aeneas' wanderings. By Vergil's time, however, Aeneia had become confused with Aenos at the mouth of the Hebrus River.³⁸ It is hard to say whether Vergil, who places the episode at Aenos, did so by error or choice. The choice, if one was involved, lies clearly in the figure of Polydorus, whose tomb was by tradition located there.³⁹ Although it had never previously been related to the Aeneas legend, his story had been immortalized, if not created,⁴⁰ by Euripides. His ghost, prophetic in the prologue of the *Hecuba*, was admirably suited to give the Aeneadae their first supernatural direction en route: *fuge crudelis terras, fuge litus avarum*. They have already founded their city and Aeneas is sacrificing to his mother when the word is received so that tradition has been served before their hasty departure. Nothing is made here, however, of leaving behind the weary. Vergil is saving this for a fuller treatment in Sicily.⁴¹

Vergil's treatment of the stops at Actium and Castrum Minervae is the product of nationalism. The commemoration of Augustus' victory in 31 B. C., the subsequent building of a temple to Apollo, and the inauguration of Actian games are the poet's reasons for picking Actium over all the other traditional stops in Western Greece.⁴² The prototype for the games which the Aeneadae celebrate at Actium was, as we have mentioned before, the games traditionally conducted at Zacynthos.

For the brief landing at Castrum Minervae Vergil takes little from the traditional account. Much is made of this as the first

³⁸ See notes 3 and 4 above.

³⁹ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 43.

⁴⁰ Schmidt-Stählen, III, p. 465.

⁴¹ See E. Swallow, "The Strategic Fifth Aeneid," *C. W.*, XLVI (1953), pp. 177-9.

⁴² Servius *ad Aen.* III, 274.

sighting of Italy and the first touching of Italian soil. There is a gradual build-up to this from the moment the Aeneadae reach Acroceraunia *unde iter Italiam cursusque brevissimus undis*. The exuberance of the sailors is unbounded as they catch their first glimpse (522 ff.):

cum procul obscuros collis humilemque videmus
Italiam. Italiam primus conclamat Achates,
Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant.

Again, the omen they receive is regarded as *primum omen* in terms of Italy alone. The performance of the rite to Juno, prescribed by Helenus, is designed to provide an august precedent for Roman sacrificial custom. There is no Patron⁴³ here to guide them across the gulf or into port. He would be as cumbersome to Vergil as the daughter of Anius (see above) and for the same reason. The poet has made the episode a very crucial one in the development of the character of Anchises, who ventures here for the first time into prophecy. The presence of a foreign guide at this point would have made this difficult. Tradition also related two landing places: *Castrum Minervae* and *Sallentinum*; but since Vergil's object, clear from the prophecy of Helenus, was to steer the Aeneadae around Greek Italy as quickly as possible, the latter was easily dispensed with.⁴⁴

We can briefly summarize with regard to Vergil's inclusion of traditional stops that his choice among them rested upon their adaptability to his design for the book, or for that matter the epic, as a whole. Those sites which either in themselves or in the traditions surrounding them fitted well into the scheme of progressive revelations to the Aeneadae were immediately incorporated. These were followed by those sites of mythological

⁴³ In book V, 298, Vergil introduces for the footrace a certain Salius (cf. p. 384 above) and a Patron *quorum alter Acarnan alter ab Arcadio Tegeaeae sanguine gentis*. He seems to have reversed their provenance.

⁴⁴ Vergil as much as apologizes in advance for excluding stops in Southern Italy; note the following warning of Helenus (397 ff.):

proxima quae nostri perfunditur aequoris aestu,
effuge; cuncta malis habitantur moenia Graias.
hic et Narycii posuerunt moenia Locri
et Sallentinos obsedit milite campos
Lyctius Idomeneus; etc.

attractiveness, even though their legends were not previously related to Aeneas, especially if they could be readily fitted into the same scheme. And finally there are those sites of historical or geographical significance which could easily be adapted to the broader, nationalistic themes of the epic. Vergil, while free to elaborate upon the story outline, treated with great deference the traditions related about these stops, but he did not hesitate to alter or omit elements which would impair the unity of his plot or the planned development of his characters.

III

The episodes at Crete, the Strophades, Scylla and Charybdis, and the abode of the Cyclops are, as far as we can tell, original with Vergil's account of Aeneas' wanderings. The fact that three of the four are from the realm of fantasy might tempt us to suppose that Vergil was not the originator of the stop at Crete. The presence of a town, Pergamum, in historical times would perhaps be naturally suggestive of a Trojan colony. Velleius Paterculus,⁴⁵ however, says that it was founded by Agamemnon. Servius⁴⁶ records a version similar to Vergil's in *libris antiquioribus* and adds that still others say that it was founded by captive Trojans in the crew of Agamemnon, an obvious conflation of the two versions.⁴⁷ We need not be over precise, for whether or not the Cretan episode is original with Vergil, it is clear that the poet leaned toward the fantastic in the additions he made to Aeneas' wanderings.

A second point to be noted about these additional stops is that they all place the Aeneadae in extreme peril. Vergil's point is clear enough. The tradition, except for an occasional storm, reads too much like a pleasant travelogue. The Trojans, wherever the tradition is full enough to record a reception, are hospitably received wherever they go, even when it is among former enemies. They suffer only from weariness and unviolent death. Something had to be done if the journey of the Aeneadae was to assume the proportions of a true odyssey, and its hero

⁴⁵ I, 1, 2.

⁴⁶ *Ad Aen.* III, 133.

⁴⁷ Cf. Perret, p. 36, note 1.

properly characterized as *terris iactatus et alto*. Vergil's turn to the fantastic sea sagas traditional to ancient epic solved two problems: it provided some serious physical obstacles for his heroes to overcome; and it added some traditional poetic substance to an account which in his sources was all too prosaic.

Vergil chose perils traditionally associated with the wandering heroes Jason and Odysseus, taking one from the *Argonautica* (the Harpies); one from both the *Argonautica* and the *Odyssey* (Scylla and Charybdis) and one from the *Odyssey* (Cyclops).⁴⁸ All three of them involve fantastic *monstra*⁴⁹ and Vergil, while influenced in detail by other developments of the myth, describes them by and large in terms of his models, Apollonius Rhodius and Homer.⁵⁰ But in each case the episode is slanted toward the main themes of book III and accommodated to the structural pattern of successive revelations to the Aeneadae. In this last respect Vergil capitalized upon the aspect of these creatures as *monstra* in the original sense, i. e. ill omens, portents. The Harpies by their very nature are suggestive of a dire prophecy of famine; hence Vergil has shifted the famous table-eating prophecy from the traditional oracle at Dodona (see above) to Celaeno and has coupled it with a prediction of Italian wars. The traditional localization of the prophecy is not ignored, however, for at Buthrotum Aeneas repeats the prophecy to Helenus, who soothes the hero's concern with the further word that the prediction will come to pass undisastrously (365 ff.).

The Scylla and Charybdis episode is in Vergil, as in Homer, in two parts: appearing once in the foretelling and once in the actual encounter; and in both authors the latter is briefer than

⁴⁸ Scylla-Charybdis and the Cyclops are placed in their traditional locations and inserted at the logical point in the journey. Vergil is somewhat unique (cf. Hyginus, XIV, 18) in placing the home of the Harpies in the Strophades, traditionally the turning-back place of their pursuers, Zetes and Calais: see Apollonius Rhodius, II, 296 f.; cf. Creutzberg, *R.-E.*, s. v. "Strophades."

⁴⁹ The Harpies (214) and the Cyclops (658) are so characterized by Vergil. For Scylla as a *monstrum* see *Ecl.*, VI, 74 f.

⁵⁰ It is not our intention, and in fact beyond the scope of the present investigation, to examine Vergil's poetic sources in detail. On the Harpy incident see H. de La Ville de Mirmont, *Apollonius de Rhodes et Virgile* (Paris, 1894), pp. 244-7. On Scylla and Charybdis see G. Hanoteau, "Charybde et Scylla," *A. C.*, VIII (1939), pp. 383-94.

the former.⁵¹ Vergil, linking this episode also with the prophecy of Helenus, makes good use of this double narration technique, for he makes the actual appearance of the monsters an almost jubilant acknowledgment of the truth of Helenus' words. The implication is that the rest of his prophecy with its assurance of the actual attaining of their goal will prove equally true. If the words of Anchises are any indication: *nimirum* (here almost "don't worry") *haec illa Charybdis*, etc., a calm determination replaces any momentary fear among the Aeneadae. Their only task, however, is to avoid the creatures, for they do not as Jason and Odysseus attempt a passage through.

In the Cyclops episode Vergil for the first time establishes a definite link between the Trojan and Greek heroes. This he does by introducing Achaemenides as an intermediary. This device allows him to recall without rivaling the Homeric story and at the same time provides sufficient area for the construction of an original episode around the character of Achaemenides.⁵² Vergil makes of the story a short epyllion, narrated in good part for its own sake. The careful construction of the piece will appear from the following scheme of its structure:

568-569 Arrival

570-587 Aetna (*immania monstra*)

588-654 Achaemenides

[A. Scene with Aeneadae 588-612

588-595 Pitiful appearance

596-607 Plea for mercy

608-612 Compassionate reception

B. His story 613-654

613-638 Ulysses' peril in cave

639-640 Advice to flee

641-654 Achaemenides' peril on island]

655-681 Polyphemus (*monstrum horrendum*) and brethren

682-683 Departure

⁵¹ Even in Apollonius Rhodius the actual encounter (IV, 922 ff.) is anticipated by Hera's appeal to Thetis, soliciting help for this peril (IV, 789 ff.).

⁵² On the similarity between this character and Sinon in book II see Carlo Pascal, *La composizione del libro terzo dell' Eneide* (Naples, 1908), pp. 11 ff.; Mackail, *op. cit.*, Appendix B (his rejection of the

The Achaemenides episode, it will be observed, has been inserted within the frame of the encounter of the Aeneadae with the *monstra* of Eastern Sicily. To dub it for this reason "unessential,"⁵³ however, is to fail to grasp an important aspect of the structure of the epyllion.

C. W. Mendell in his excellent study, "The Influence of the Epyllion on the *Aeneid*,"⁵⁴ using Catullus LXIV as example, notes as one of the characteristics of the form "the construction of a picture within a frame . . . evident not only in the poem as a whole . . . but also within the parts in a tendency to focus on a central point and so produce the framework effect." This focal-point construction is clearly evident here, but what is most significant is the manner in which Vergil has employed this technique to slant the episode toward his pattern of successive supernatural directives issued to the Aeneadae. Within the framework of the portentous *monstra* he has placed the Achaemenides episode, chief interest of which lies in the narrative of Ulysses' perils and his own perils on the island after Ulysses' departure. At the focal point, abruptly dividing these two phases of his story, is his advice to flee: *fugite, O miseri, fugite atque ab litore funem rumpite*, which, as has been observed before, brings us full circle to the words of Polydorus' ghost at the beginning of the book.

The following observations can be made about the stops which Vergil has on his own incorporated into Aeneas' travels in book III. Recognizing in the tradition a lack of 1) episodes of poetic interest and 2) obstacles to test the physical courage of his heroes, the poet turned to the traditional sea sagas to supply both these needs. By concentrating on the horrendous *monstra* he has been able to incorporate such scenes without departing

Achaemenides scene is hardly acceptable to the present author); cf. W. F. J. Knight, "Pairs of Passages in Virgil," *Greece and Rome*, XIII (1944), pp. 10-14.

⁵³ Mackail, *loc. cit.*

⁵⁴ *Yale Class. Stud.*, XII (1951), pp. 205-26. On the importance of the story-within-the-story technique for the form, see M. M. Crump, *The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid* (Oxford, 1931), pp. 23 f., and consult index, s.v. "digressions." She has in her final chapter, however, failed to appreciate the subtle influence of epyllion on "grand epic," terming the appearance of epyllion structure in epic "weakness." See also Semple, *op. cit.*, pp. 234 ff.

from the design of progressive revelations. The descriptions of the creatures follow the classic ones of Homer and Apollonius of Rhodes, but for the episodes themselves Vergil has contrived original events.

From the above consideration we can make some pretty safe generalizations about Vergil's approach to the traditions surrounding the Aeneas legend in book III. Faced with the prosaic, repetitious and often conflicting accounts of various localizations of the Aeneadae in the Mediterranean world, Vergil's initial problem was of plot and structure. The legend itself suggested a series of stops, but some central theme was necessary to avoid the entirely episodic character of tradition. Again there were in the tradition oracles regarding the settlement of the Trojan colony, one of which, according to some versions at least, was received en route. This was the seed of Vergil's elaborate design to start the Aeneadae on their journey fairly ignorant of both route and destination and by a series of divinely inspired omens, oracles, prophecies, and the like (indicating the gravity of their mission) guide them with increasing awareness to Latium. The two moods, or rather two aspects of the same mood, which were to dominate this journey were mental weariness and despair from seemingly forever failing their goal, and physical exhaustion from hardship and toil along the way. For the former a certain artistic advantage could be taken from the monotony of the tradition with its repetitious events. For the latter Vergil had to look elsewhere.

With regard to specific stops and episodes Vergil approached the tradition with a certain respect, yet with an essential sense of economy. If the episodes were to be developed in an interesting manner and still encompassed within a single book, the number of stops had to be pared. Vergil's conservatism is revealed by the method of reduction, i. e. two or more stops or events are often combined or telescoped rather than completely sacrificed. Most likely to be dropped of course were those involving contradictions, unreasonable or overly repetitious action, or those which would seriously interfere with the broader developments of plot or character. On the other hand those locations and events which were adaptable to the structure and motifs of the whole, and especially those of some greater mythological, historical, or national interest, were immediately made the center

for the development of major episodes. In the stops of his own devising Vergil confronted his heroes with some of the *monstra* traditional to sea epic from Homer down.

It should be noted in conclusion that Vergil in book III of the *Aeneid* made no compromises with tradition (either of the Aeneas legend or of epic poetry) which would jeopardize the unity of his work. This can be stated in regard both to the creation of the individual episode and the larger pattern through which the various parts are related. The episodes, whatever their source and inspiration, are in concept and structure entirely Vergilian and executed with the meticulous care we have come to associate with him.

ROBERT B. LLOYD.

CORNELL COLLEGE,
MOUNT VERNON, IOWA.

MODERN GREEK CORRECTIONS TO BUCK'S DICTIONARY.

Carl Darling Buck's *Dictionary of Selected Indo-European Synonyms* (Chicago, 1949) has been reviewed in at least twenty-seven periodicals; in none of these has there been mention of modern Greek. As yet there has been no attempt, to my knowledge, to survey the materials of this all-important work systematically, that is language by language. The great scope of the work and its value for all kinds of research in Indo-European and general linguistics deserve this concentrated attention by specialists. Close observation of the modern Greek element in the *Dictionary* reveals a certain number of errors and omissions, and since the amount of accurate information available about this language is very much smaller than is generally believed, it is imperative that non-specialists be given a corrected picture of this element. The following collection of over 100 addenda and corrigenda to the modern Greek part of the dictionary has its chief source in my own dictionary of modern Greek, compiled chiefly from oral sources, and now being prepared for the printer. On several points of usage I have also consulted my friend, Miss Athena Lymberi of Piraeus. I have not examined the Ancient Greek *per se*, and all references to Greek in the following are to modern Greek, unless the terms ancient or medieval (Byzantine) are used. Two general criticisms may be made first.

There are some inconsistencies of presentation. The preface (pp. xii-xiii) characterizes the NGr element (in the *Dictionary*) as mostly demotic. Yet katharevusa (k.) forms are sprinkled rather liberally throughout. This in itself is permissible, since many k. words are now in common use, and in fact are inescapable. In morphology, however, k. might have been omitted. Feminines in (ancient) *-sis*¹ are usually listed in Buck, instead of the demotic *-si*. There is scanty provision in modern Greek structure for the *-sis* declensional type. Such words (like *ἔνωσις* 'union') are used in isolation, or as nominative singulars.

¹ Of 17 such words, two, *ἐπίθεσις* (20.43) and *ὑποχώρησις* (20.45), are so listed; two, *κόψη* (12.353) and *ἀνοιξη* (14.75), are given demotic forms; the other 13 are given the full *-sis*.

More noticeable is the discrepancy in use of final *-n* (neuter, ancient 2nd decl.). Byzantine Greek (and modern Cypriote) retains this *-n*, but standard Greek has lost it. In the first 200 pages of the *Dictionary* there are six words listed with final *-n*, and an equal number of words without the *-n*. I can discover no reason for this alternation.²

A second point needs some discussion. Buck's use of the term *literary* requires a little explaining to those not acquainted with the 'language problem' of modern Greece. In the demotic language (the natural inherited Greek common to all Greeks except those who speak the more archaic Pontic, Cypriote, or Tsaconian) we have an extensive folk literature. All of the famous folk tales, folk songs and the minor genres are written in demotic. Since about 1800, however, a more learned literary language has evolved, which differs from demotic in the varying proportions of artificially borrowed or coined words (to a lesser extent in morphology and syntax). The most formal and artificial level is pure katharevusa, which a Plato or a Demosthenes would have little difficulty in reading. Down the scale are the other levels, each with a percentage of formal vocabulary. This is the result of schooling and linguistic patriotism of the last century and a half. The success of this 'purifying' movement has resulted in demotic, the only really inherited language, being itself now cultivated somewhat as an artificial language, likewise for patriotic and sentimental reasons. All varieties of modern Greek therefore are used for literary expression, and the label *literary* has ceased to have linguistic meaning. The terms demotic and katharevusa should be used to refer to natural and artificial language, both having, of course, in time influenced each other.

The comments now follow in the order of Buck's entries. It should be noticed that, since the entries are English, Buck is culturally bound to his selection of terms, and anyone's opinion may be valid as to the meaning of many terms listed without context, so, e.g. FLAT or EMPTY, and many verbs. Another matter: Greek does not have the settled status (lexically speaking) that obtains largely in French or English. Hence I have

² The words are, with final *-n*: *πεδίον* 1.23, *δένδρον* 1.42, *ξύλον* 1.43, *φύλον* 2.242, *ζῶον* 3.11, *χοιρίδιον* 3.35; without *-n*: *βουνό* 1.22, *νερό* 1.31, *σύννεφο* 1.73, *σπίρτο* 1.87, *πρόβατο* 3.25, *ἄλογο* 3.51; also *passim* the suffix *-πουλο*.

added, as being equally good if not so common, certain other words. The lack of a dialect atlas for Greek makes the selection very difficult.

1.215 (SAND) ἄμμος: fem. (k.) or masc. (coll.).

1.41 (WOODS, FOREST) read (ancient Gk.) ὕλη.

1.42 (TREE) δέντρο ['ðendro], like ἄντρας (2.21).

1.72 (WIND) add also (and more commonly) ἀέρας; 'breeze' is ἀεράκι.

A reference to names of winds should have been made, and their meanings as compass points. Cross-reference to 12.45 ff. See my note on this, below.

2.1 (MAN, HUMAN BEING) add (coll.) ἄθρωπος (like 2.61 πεθερός).

2.33 (MARRY) νυμφεύομαι is used only (chiefly?) in the church service, like English 'wed.' Correct spelling of English 'marry' in the list.

3.22 (OX) place diaeresis on iota: βόιδι, and add βόδι (from Buck's note).

3.33 (BARROW) remove comma from between the two words which form a phrase, meaning 'castrated pig' (cf. 3.27 and 3.43).

3.46 (ASS, DONKEY) γομάρι is used in rural areas for the animal; in the cities only of persons, in a depreciatory sense, like English 'ass.' Remove acute accent from last syllable of γαῖδούρι.

4.11 (BODY) σῶμα is the polite term; κορμί also used; from *κορμ-ίον < ancient κορμός 'log.'

4.12 (SKIN) also τομάρι (animal skin), a medieval diminutive of τόμος.

4.34 (FINGER) Modern Greek shows some dialectal and individual differences in the names of the fingers. A dialect atlas of Greece would have to include these terms on its list. It is unfortunate that Buck did not give the other finger names; he lists only THUMB. A few days' research on this semantic area revealed a preliminary conclusion that in many European languages the 'ring finger' has no name, or no common name, or only an artificial name. Likewise the middle finger, for which French for example has the obviously learned Latinism *médius*. The

little finger seems to be so called in most European languages. There is much complication in this whole area, and very likely a sizable dissertation could be written on the subject. The modern Greek equivalents, so far as I have been able to determine them, are the following:

- a. 'forefinger' δείκτης from the verb δείκνω (ancient δείκνυμι) 'point out,' but the ancient noun is λιχανός from the zero grade of the verb λείχω 'lick,' plus suffix. Is the modern word a recent coinage? Unlikely. Andriotis³ does not list the word.
- b. 'middle finger' μεσαῖος. The ancient is μέσος, as found in Plato and Aristotle. (See Liddell-Scott-Jones, s. v.)
- c. 'ring finger' παράμεσος, also not listed in Andriotis. It seems to be a post-classical coinage, since it is first found in Apuleius (II A. D.), and in three contemporary Greek technical writers.⁴
- d. 'little finger' μικρό δάχτυλο (as in ancient Gk.: Aristotle has μικρὸς δάκτυλος).

In leaving this subject I should mention that many foreign-language-to-English dictionaries which I have consulted lacked names for several of the fingers, giving chiefly or only thumb and forefinger. Is this because of the apparent triviality of the subject, or were the compilers culture-bound to English, this language using only phrases for the last three fingers? This may be an unexplored lexicographical problem.

4.42 (UDDER) read βυζί (like 4.41).

³ For this reference and others see bibliographical remarks at end.

⁴ Apuleius, *Metam.*, X, 21 (ed. R. Halm [1913], p. 252 note; Adlington-Gaselee in the Loeb [1915], p. 596). These two editors excise the passage from their texts, but regard it as authentic since two MSS carry it in the margin. The pertinent words are: 'Ac dein digitis, hypate, lichano, mese, paramese, et nete' (*sic* Gaselee). The passage is defective and difficult but the names of fingers, and/or of tones (of a five-stringed instrument) named from the fingers, are clearly intended.

The Greek references (Liddell-Scott-Jones) are as follows: Pollux, II, 145, Rufus Medicus, *Onom.*, 83, Galen, II, 264. By a curious coincidence all these authors, including Apuleius, are of the 2nd century A. D.

- 4.65 ('MEARE') the child's idiom is *κάνω τσίσια*, or *τίσια*, the noun being from Turkish.
- 4.66 ('CACARE') the child's idiom is *κάνω (τά) κακά (μου)*.
- 4.75 (DIE, note) *ψοφῶ* is used of animals.
- 4.92 (LAZY) *τεμπέλης* is a noun, 'loafer,' not an adj.
- 5.16 (SUCK) add *ρουνφῶ* (non-lactative meaning), from ancient *ῥοφῶ* 'gulp.'
- 5.17 (MIX) the more central verb is *σμίγω* from ancient *μείγνυμι*; with unexplained initial *s-* (unless by metathesis from an ancient variant *μίσγω*).
- 5.31 (DISH) in first paragraph of notes, read *πιατικά* (plural).
- 5.33 (BOWL) This word, out of context, is hard to pin down semantically. One should add *μπόλ*, from English *bowl* (or through French?); also the phrase *βαθύ πιάτο* 'deep dish.'
- 5.35 (CUP) see preceding note. *κούπα* (without handles) is used for soup.
- 5.42 (BREAKFAST) spell *κολατσιό*, and gloss 'brunch' (Piraeus meaning).
- 5.52 (CAKE) This word is extremely difficult to gloss because of the many sizes, shapes, flavors, ingredients, and purposes of a 'cake,' even in the same region and language. Cf. English cup-cake, coffee-cake, birthday-cake, and similar concoctions. To the Greek list add *τουῖρτα*, a large birthday cake, from Italian *torta*. Also from British or (more likely) American English *κέκ* [kek].
- 5.56 (GRIND) add *κόβω* 'cut,' which may be used for coffee and grain.
- 5.612 (BUTCHER) *κασάπης* is a regionalism. More commonly is found the form with initial *χ-*, as Buck gives it in footnote 1.
- 5.64 (SOUP) *σοῦπα* is derived from Italian *zuppa* only with difficulty, in view of the word *τσάπα* 'hoe' from Ital. *zappa* and several similar examples. See 6.91 below. Perhaps we have a blend with the English or French *soup(e)*.
- 5.80 (BERRY) *κόκκος* seems to mean only 'grain' (seed of a cereal plant). A common (but there may be others) word for berry is *μούρο*, which means primarily 'mulberry,' and comes from ancient *μόρον*.

- 5.85 (SUGAR) read ζάχαρη, that is feminine, not neuter. Also correct the gender in note 1. Byz. Grk. seems to have had a neuter form; perhaps the word needs more investigation, not only in Greek but also in the neighboring languages.
- 6.12 (CLOTHING) add ρουχικά (plur.) and ρουχισμός (collective singular).
- 6.36 (NEEDLE) βελόνα is a large needle for knitting.
- 6.44 (SHIRT) read also πουκάμισο, the more coll. form.
- 6.55 (CAP) add σκουφί, from Ital. *scuffia*.
- 6.58 (GLOVE) χειρόχτι often means a heavy work glove, such as might be used by bee-keepers.
- 6.75 (NECKLACE) the entry is k.; add τό κολιέ (from French *collier*).
- 6.91 (COMB) Add τσατσάρα from Ital. *zazzera* 'long hair' (from Germanic?).
- 6.92 (BRUSH) Buck's etymology is vague. The Albanian *vurcë* and Turkish *fırca* must be taken into consideration in determining the history of the word. Andriotis likewise is unsatisfactory.
- 7.11 (DWELL) add μένω (ancient 'remain'); see note on 12.16, below.
- 8.41 (HARVEST) the second form is k.; add θέρισμα (ancient *θερισμός*). In note 1, 2nd line from end, read συγκομίζω.
- 8.43 (WHEAT) add στάρι, by syncope from σιτάρι.
- 8.55 (BRANCH) add κλαρί, obscurely from κλαδί (or its source).
- 8.69 (SMOKE, tobacco) note 3: the NGr idiom πίνω καπνό (like the Rumanian and Serbian equivalents) must be a translation loan from Turkish *içmek* (drink; smoke), occasioned by the adoption of the Persian water-pipe, NGr *ναργιλές*.
- 9.52 (BOARD; PLANK) Both carpenters and laymen distinguish two practical sizes in English. One can stand or walk on a plank, but not on a board. 'Plank' in NGr is μαδέρι, from Venetian Italian *madero* (from Latin *materia* 'lumber'); cf. standard Italian *mátero* (twig, wicker material); A. Souter's *Glossary of Later Latin* gives a neuter Latin *materium*.
- 9.87 (PAINTING) εικόνα (correct the accent).
- 9.89 (PAINT, a house) add βάφω, meaning also 'dye' (Buck 6.39).

- 9.97 (DIFFICULT) p. 651a, lines 13-14, for 'hard to hear,' read 'hard to bear.'
- 9.98 (TRY, test) p. 652b, 4 lines from bottom: *πειράζω* also means in NGr 'try one's patience, tease, bother.'
- 10.24 (DROP, sb. of liquid) add *σταλα(γ)ματιά* from ancient *στάλαγμα(τ-)* plus *-ιά*; *-ματιά* has become a new, though minor, noun formant in Greek; cf. *δαγκοματιά* 'a bite,' etc. Add also *στάλα*, as in the phrase *οὔτε στάλα* 'not a drop.'
- 10.25 (THROW) NGr *πετῶ* (p. 673b, 4 lines from bottom) means also 'throw away, discard.'
- 10.41 (CREEP) in note 2, the phrase *μέ τήν κοιλιά* calls for English 'on (one's) belly,' not 'with . . .'; cf. *μέ τά πόδια* 'on foot.'
- 10.45 (WALK) ancient *βαδίζω* is also used in formal NGr in the sense 'march,' of an army.
- 10.51 (FLEE) add the more common idiom *(τό) σκάω*, e. g. *Τόσκασε*. 'He ran away.'
- 10.61 (CARRY) also (and better) *κουβαλῶ*, from ancient *κόβαλος* 'knave,' but this etymon, given by Andriotis, is semantically difficult. *φέρνω* is usually FETCH, BRING (10.62).
- 10.65 (DRIVE, vb. trans.) add the common verb *πηγαίνω* [which is the usual verb for 'go']. A shepherd, for example, *πηγαίνει τά πρόβατα του* 'drives his sheep.' Add also *σωφάρω* (aor. *σωφάριξα*) for 'drive a car, truck'; from French *chauffeur*.
- 10.75 (WAGON) add *ταλίκια*, like the SCr word, a borrowing from Turkish.
- 11.12 (OWN, POSSESS) *ἔχω* 'have' is very frequently used in this meaning.
- 11.24 (SAVE) read *σώνω* for the second item, as in Buck's note.
- 11.41 (PROPERTY) add *τά καλά* 'goods.'
- 11.52 (BEGGAR) add *ζήτουλας*.
- 11.55 (MISER) the third word in Buck's list is an orthographic mess. It is to be spelled *σπαγγοραμμένος* and to be derived from *σπάγγος* 'string' plus *ραμμένος*, participle of *ράβω* 'sew.'
- 11.79 (EARN) add also *κάνω* 'do, make,' like the English 'make money.'
- 12.11 (PLACE) *τόπος* is k.; the usual word is *μέρος*.

- 12.14 (LIE) add *ξαπλώνομαι* 'be lying down, be reclining'; from *ξε-* + *ἀπλῶ*.
- 12.16 (WAIT) *περιμένω* means 'wait for'; *μένω* is 'live at, dwell.'
- 12.36 (SIDE) add *πλάγι* (from ancient *πλάγιος* 'slanting'); the same word spelled *πλάϊ* means 'near, next to,' as a particle.
- 12.41 (RIGHT) add the by-form *δεξις*, like *μακρύς* (LONG, 12.57) by analogy with ancient *u*-stems.
- 12.45 ff. (EAST, WEST, NORTH, SOUTH) The introductory paragraphs should have contained more direct reference to wind-names as the source of compass-point names. Only Luther's German is mentioned in this connection. (Cf. *s.vv.* Breton 'west,' Balto-Slavic 'north,' ancient Greek 'north, south,' etc.) Modern Greek shows, like some other Mediterranean languages, a wide variety of wind names. The forms listed by Buck are *k.*, and are undoubtedly used by the Navy, but the fisherman and the average sailor knows and uses another set, derived from (Venetian) Italian.

Local differences are due only partly to dialect variation; geography, climate, and occupation (mariner, shepherd, etc.) also play a part. Vlastos (p. 361) lists about 35 wind names which are also compass points; of these the following may be considered standard and widespread.

East (wind): *λεβάντης* (ὅ) (Ital. *levante* [through Turkish?]; this word has a complicated history).

West (wind): *πουνέντης* (ὅ) (Ital. *ponente*).

North (wind): *τραμουντάνα* (Ital. *tramontana*).

South (wind): *ὄστρια* (Venetian *ostria*?. The standard Italian has *ostro*, now poetic, from Latin *auster*).

S-E (wind): *σορόκος*, *σιρόκος* from Ital. *scirocco*.

One may get a good idea of 16th century directional terms by looking at A. Delatte's *Les Portulans grecs*,⁵ both the text and the index. Other common terms in these navigational guides to the Mediterranean are *μέτζο* *δί* (south; Venetian Ital. *mezzo di*), and *μαῖστρος* (NW).

⁵ Liège, 1947.

The only common purely Greek term in these texts is *μεσημέριον* (noon; south). The whole subject in general, and Mediterranean winds and directions in particular, need a thorough study.

- 12.71 (FLAT) *πλακωτός* seems to be used to describe a flat bottle chiefly. 'flat cigarettes' (actually oval) are *πλατειά τσιγάρα*. The closest common words are *ἴσος* and *ἐπίπεδος*. The semantic difficulty here lies in the English.
- 13.17 (LITTLE, FEW) add (coll.) *λίγος*, by regular apocope of initial unstressed vowel. Correct the Latin entry to *pauci*.
- 13.19 (CROWD) add *κόσμος* (a common secondary meaning of this word).
- 13.34 (ONE) In note 2, mention should be made of the NGr feminine, *μιά*, which in popular language has shifted the accent and monosyllabized the word: ['mnja]; the epenthetic *n* is regular between *m* and *j*.
- 13.45 (THREE, TRIO) p. 950a, line 1: read *εἰκοσαριά*. In this whole section I miss a reference to *τρι-* used as an intensive prefix, as had been also ancient *τρισ-* 'very.' Cf. ancient *τρισμακάριος* (there are about 10 such), and NGr *τρισκόταδο* 'deep shadow,' *τριγύρω* 'all around,' etc.
- 14.24 (DELAY, vb. intr.) add also *ἀργῶ*, and (of vehicles on a schedule) *ἀργοπορῶ*; from ancient *ἀργῶ* 'be lazy'; *ἀργοπορῶ* from the same plus *πόρος* 'passage.'
- 14.41 (DAY) add the shorter form *μέρα*, whose first vowel is lost by regular sound change (see note on 13.17, above); however both forms may be heard concurrently, perhaps as sandhi alternants. Note the free phrase *μέρα νύχτα* 'night and day.'
- 14.72 (names of the months). This semantic area, like that of compass points and wind-names, is very complex for modern Greek, as it was (and Buck here so states) for ancient Greek. In addition to the lit. (*sic*) and popular series of names (both from Latin) referred to on p. 1011b, each dialect area had its own list, some of which terms (with phonetic variants) are common to modern Greek in general. The terms refer to phenomena of weather, season, state of the crop, etc. Vlastos (p. 367) lists 91 alternative month names, of which November

with 14, March with 12 lead the list, and January, April, and August end the list with 4 each. Not every dialect has a full complement of alternatives, since official calendars and the impact of the schools and courts have taken their toll. There is some semantic overlapping of names, from one region to another, e.g. Τρν(γ)ητής is August or September, depending on the region. Probably latitude and altitude account for this. The island of Skyros⁶ shows seven alternatives, of which the following are typical of Greek in general:

June: Θεριστής from ancient Greek, 'reaper' or ' (month of) reaping.'

Sept.: Τρνητής from ancient τρνγάω 'gather grapes,' plus suffix. The subject has not gone unnoticed. Cf. Ath. Ch. Buturas, *Ta onomata ton minon* . . . (Athens, 1910); the index lists over 90 items, including variants; presumably Vlastos owes his list to Buturas.⁷

15.26 (BAD SMELLING) βρώμικος means only 'dirty'; see 15.88.

15.35 (SWEET) also γλυκύς (inherited or reintroduced?).

15.67 (BLUE) add μπλέ (uninflected); from French *bleu* (as in note 2).

15.77 (SMOOTH) rather όμαλός, which in ancient Gr. meant 'level, even.'

15.79 (DULL, BLUNT) rather στομομένος from στομώνω 'temper, blunt'; an ancient source στομόω (secondary meaning: 'harden') is disputable.

15.88 (DIRTY) λερός is a regionalism only, and means 'filthy.'

16.35 (PITY) λύπη is more colloquial.

16.43 (RAGE) add φοῦρκα from Latin *furca* 'fork; gallows'; hence 'rage,' the latter meaning perhaps by connection with *furia* (?).

16.45 (SHAME) έντροπή usually appears in NGr as ντροπή [dro'pi], especially in the phrase ντροπή σου 'shame on

⁶ Cf. N. L. Perdika, *Skyros*, II (Athens, 1948), p. 306.

⁷ Add also the author's addenda, and two reviews, in *Laographia*, II (1910/11), pp. 304-6; 506-9, 698-9; also reviews in *Byz. Zeit.*, XX (1911), pp. 253-7, *Mitt. Sem. Orient. Spr.*, XIV, 2 (1911/12), pp. 218-22.

- you.' Regular loss of unstressed initial vowel, in this case taking away with it the nasal.
- 16.51 (DARE) *τολμῶ* is 'literary.' NGr uses periphrasis for the various meanings of 'dare.'
- 16.55 (COWARDLY) NGr has a noun *φοβητσιάρης* 'coward' from *φόβος* plus *-ητσ-ιάρης*. NGr often prefers noun to adj. in describing personality traits.
- 16.68 (DECEIT) add *ξεγέλασμα*, from *ξε-* (ancient *έξ-*) plus *γελᾶω* 'laugh; deceive.'
- 17.11 (MIND) add *μναλό* (also meaning 'brain'; in plur. 'common sense').
- 17.14 (THINK; BE OF OPINION) add (*μοῦ*) *φαίνεται* 'it seems to (me),' as in 17.18 (SEEM).
- 17.17: p. 1210b, line 1: capitalize *Πρακτικά*, as name of a journal.
- 17.21 (WISE) *φρόνιμος* has a further semantic development in NGr, as seen in the injunction to a noisy child: *Κάτσε φρόνιμα* 'Sit still!', 'Be good!'
- 17.23 (INSANE) add *παλαβός*, whose etymology is disputed.
- 17.27 (TEACHER) Since women teachers (in the West) are the rule in elementary and middle schools, the feminine forms might have been given. NGr is *δασκάλα*, made from *δάσκαλος*.
- 17.33 (MEANING) note 1, end (top of p. 1232): the verbal phrase *πάει νά πῃ* is also used for 'mean.'
- 17.36 (SECRET) add *μυστικός* (ancient 'mystical,' etc.).
- 17.42 (CAUSE) add *ἀφορμή*, the ancient word (inherited or reintroduced?).
- 18.14 (verbs referring to animal cries). Additional NGr forms are:

3. (bleat) *βελάζω*
5. (crow) *κράζω*
8. (hiss) *σφυρίζω* also ('whistle')
9. (howl) *οὐ(ρ)λιάζω*: the *-ρ-* is due to influence of Ital. *urlare*
11. (neigh) *χλιμεντρῶ* from ancient *χρεμετίζω*
- 2, 7, 12 (bellow, growl, roar) *μονγκρῶζω*
- (13. bray, of a donkey) *γκαρίζω*
- also CLUCK (hen) *κακαρίζω*, BZZ (mosquito, bee) *βονίζω*, CHIRP (small bird) *κελαϊδῶ*.

- 18.23 (BE SILENT) add *σωπάζω*, which shares its aorist *σώπασα* with *σωπαίνω*.
- 18.34 (DENY) Spell the second form *ἀρνιέμαι*; this is the popular form, the other is formal (k.). Same distinction at 17.31 (REMEMBER), and 18.37 (REFUSE). At 16.34 *λυπᾶμαι* should have been similarly added alongside the formal variety.
- 18.44 (THREATEN) The entry *φοβερίζω* means primarily 'frighten.'
- 19.33 (QUEEN) 'queen at cards' is *ντάμα*, from Ital. *dama*, or though Ital. from Old French.
- 19.61 (CUSTOM) add *συνήθειο* and *συνήθεια*, the first form from the second by change of gender.
- 19.62 (QUARREL) add *τσακωμός*; related to *τσακώνομαι* 'dispute' (etym. uncertain).
- 19.65 (MEET) *συναντῶ* 'meet by appointment'; *ἀνταμώνω* 'meet by chance.'
- 20.17 (SOLDIER) add colloquial *φαντάρος*, from Ital. *fanteria*, minus suffix, with change of meaning and gender.
- 20.22 (CLUB) On the etymology of *ματσοῦκα*, where Buck says 'from some form of the Romance group,' Andriotis gives a Venetian (Ital.) form *mazzoca*. Buck's note 2 (p. 1385a) mentions the VLat source of this form.
- 20.47 (PRISONER) add *φυλακισμένος* 'one imprisoned (for crime)'; the entry given means 'prisoner of war,' as in ancient Greek.
- 22.182 (protestant minister) the NGr is *κήρυκας*, from ancient *κήρυξ* 'herald.'

I have hesitated over a few other items, but because I have not the time nor the resources to take numerous little dialect polls, I must pass them by. It should be stated, however, that because of the great dialect diversity in modern Greek, in comparison with which American English dialects have a monotonous sameness, it is very difficult to draw up a lexical list in which every item is known to every speaker of Greek. Buck's list contains several entries which would not be general terms. Some of my addenda likewise are not necessarily pan-Hellenic.

Buck's bibliography (pp. 2-7) could not have listed the recent work of N. P. Andriotis, *Etymologiko Lexiko tis Koinis Neoel-*

linikis (Athens, 1951), referred to above.⁸ Buck lists, besides the journals, the antiquated essays of G. Meyer, G. Hatzidakis, and Pernot's school edition of texts; also Koraes' *Atakta* (a product of the early 19th century) is referred to several times in the notes but not mentioned in the bibliography. The *Istorikon Lexikon* had only produced a few fascicules when Buck was writing, and it still has not progressed beyond *gamma*. Over 170 reference works and monographs on modern Greek exist in print, and Buck must have referred to some of these occasionally. One very important item must not have been known to him, however, for even without a specific citation, its influence would have shown itself in the *Dictionary*, not only for the modern Greek element, but also in the general ordering of material. It is Petros Vlastos' *Synonyma kai Syngenika* (Athens, 1931); this work is the best synonymy known to me in any language, and is a model for anyone wishing to construct this kind of work for another language.

Use of this work might have altered somewhat the English-oriented selection of entries. For example it would be only a speaker of a Germanic language to whom it might occur to enter a word *TOE*, or the northern European *OAK*.

In general, Buck's Modern Greek etymologies show an expert's hand at work; koine and Byzantine Greek alike are manipulated with dexterity. Only one gap need be mentioned: the Venetian Italian element in Greek is not well handled. See several of my notes above, and for general orientation (but on place-name elements only): H. & R. Kahane, *Italienische Ortsnamen in Griechenland* (Athens, 1940).

In view of the kinds of errors and omissions listed above, there remains in one's mind a doubt as to how well Buck utilized his native informants. It is even possible that some good information was ignored. Yet Buck was concerned with the vocabularies of some thirty IE languages, carried over three millennia, and all the cultural and linguistic data of their vocabularies. One can expect too much, even in this outstanding landmark in linguistic studies.

DONALD C. SWANSON.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

⁸ Useful, but caution is indicated, espec. in reference to modern borrowings from western Europe.

REVIEWS.

EDGAR LOBEL and DENYS PAGE. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955. Pp. xxxviii + 337.

DENYS PAGE. *Sappho and Alcaeus, an Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955. Pp. ix + 340.

As it was a pleasure in 1944 to welcome in this journal the publication, in *P. Oxy.* XVIII, of major accessions to Lesbian poetry, so again ten years later it is a correspondingly greater pleasure to welcome with all gratitude a new and as nearly as possible definitive edition of these poets, including the additional accessions from *P. Oxy.* XXI and other sources, as well as the splendid companion volume of interpretation and exegesis. The editions of Sappho and Alcaeus produced by Lobel in 1925 and 1927 respectively have, of course, become standard and the studies of the language of the two poets included in these two volumes have put the criticism of the text of the fragments of their poetry on a new and more secure footing. Many have followed in the footsteps of Lobel, particularly in the editing and interpretation of new fragments but none has matched his mastery. Since 1952 (cf. *C. Q.*, XLVI [1952], pp. 1 ff.) he has, however, found an able collaborator in Page whose wide-ranging familiarity with Greek poetry is a great asset.

The severely critical character of the earlier editions is continued in the first of the volumes here under review but the second of them will serve to open the new knowledge contained in the first to many who must have been rebuffed by the earlier editions for lack of any interpretive apparatus in English.

The *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* is most noteworthy for the service it performs in making readily available in one volume all the known fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus. Since the publication of Lobel's earlier volumes ($\Sigma\mu.$ and $A\mu.$) a considerable amount of new papyrus material has come to light and been published in various places. For Sappho there are, in comparison with $\Sigma\mu.$, eight new papyri (*P. Oxy.* 2288-94 and *P. Haun.* 301), all of the second or third century after Christ, and an ostrakon of the third century B. C., plus three fragments of previously known papyri [*P. Oxy.* 2081(c), 2166(a), and 2166(d)]. These bring us some 265 new lines or parts of lines of poetry. Many of these lines are represented by only a letter or two but there are two fairly complete poems (2 and 98) and three fragments of commentary (90, 103, and 213). For Alcaeus there is an even greater addition to $A\mu.$, including sixteen new papyri (*P. Oxy.* 2295-2307, *P. Fouad* 239, and *P. Heidelb.*) of the first to the third centuries after Christ, plus five new fragments of previously known papyri [*P. Oxy.* 1788, 2081, 2165, 2166(b) and (c)]. These again bring us some 1100 new lines and parts of lines. The more complete new poems are 129, 130, 283, 298, and 304, and there are two extensive fragments of

commentary. Two small new scraps (*P. Oxy.* 2308 and *P. Graec. Vindob.* 29777) cannot be attributed with certainty to either poet. This comparison is greatly facilitated by the *Manuscriptorum Catalogus* (pp. ix-xi) and elaborate *Numerorum Tabulae* (xii-xxxvii) giving correspondences between this edition and Σμ., Αμ., Bergk, Diehl, and the papyrus publications. To this apparatus is added only a list of abbreviations (p. xxxviii) in which I miss e. p. = *editio princeps* and Old English p = papyrus. The addition of a bibliography would have been valuable. In the apparatus to Sappho fr. 98, 2, e. g., a supplement is attributed to Gallavotti but there is no means of telling from this edition where the supplement was proposed by Gallavotti. The work of at least 75 scholars is so referred to throughout the apparatus criticus. On the other hand, it is surprising to find no reference in the apparatus on Alcaeus fr. 129 to any of the 24 articles dealing with this poem as listed by Page in *Sappho and Alcaeus*, p. 163. Excellent bibliographies are supplied by Max Treu in his little Tuseulum editions: *Alkaios Lieder* (Munich, 1952), pp. 92-8 and *Sappho Lieder* (Munich, 1954), pp. 128-36.

The presentation of the texts is meticulous, a marvel of painstaking accuracy. One may be inclined to feel that there is too much of the lumber of papyrological scholarship left showing and that this is an edition of papyri rather than of poets, but it is difficult to see how this could have been avoided if the purposes of scholarship were to be served; and who but scholars can make anything of the bulk of these texts? Still the apparatus does become somewhat unwieldy when it is necessary, as in Sappho, fr. 1, to use two kinds of brackets to show the relation of the portions preserved in the papyrus to the text as preserved in the literary tradition (the part of the text preserved in the latter [line 19] being omitted as illegible in the papyrus!) or, as in Sappho, fr. 44, when it is necessary to resort even to half brackets to distinguish between the contributions of two different papyri. The occasional use of parenthesized dots, as in Sappho, fr. 96 (ἀ [. . (.)]. νίδηον), to indicate a variable number of illegible letters may also be puzzling without any explanation.

The scheme of arrangement of the fragments follows in general that of Σμ. and Αμ. For Sappho 117 of the 213 fragments can be assigned to one of the books of the Alexandrian edition, but the serial numeration should be used in citation. On the other hand only 18 of the 448 fragments of Alcaeus can be assigned to a book. Consequently each of the 22 papyri is assigned a letter of the Latin alphabet and the fragments preserved in each are numbered separately. The fragments assigned to books follow these and then the quoted fragments *incerti libri* are lumped together under the letter Z 1-125. How this system can be expanded to accommodate any new papyri is not evident. In any case it is to be hoped that the fragments will be cited by the serial numbers 1-448 rather than by the more awkward letter plus number as Page seems to prefer.

One other mechanical matter is the presentation of the fragments of commentary. I should have expected to find them separated from the texts of the poems. For Sappho, however, they are placed according to the book to which they refer (90 at the end of Δ, 103

under H and 213 at the end of all the fragments) and for Alcaeus under 305 and 306 = V and X (1)–(80). They should at least have been distinguished from the fragments of the poets by some external indication. Why Sappho 103 is presented in a documentary transcription on p. 84 as well as in normal textual form on the following page is not explained.

The text itself is so conservative in respect to the admission of supplements that I find little on which to differ with the editors. On the readings of the papyri the non-expert must, of course, defer to the papyrologist, and surely the editors have reported in the minutest detail on every observable trace of a vertical or horizontal shaft of defaced letters, but one may be permitted an occasional doubt as to the absolute certainty of what is reported. On the basis of photographs I would harbor such a doubt, e. g., on Sappho 97(b), 8. The editors now print $\phi\nu\gamma\alpha\varsigma \uparrow . . \iota\sigma\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\sigma\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ where *e. p.* reported more confidently $\phi\nu\gamma\alpha\sigma\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\sigma\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$. The present edition does not even suggest the possibility that the first $\iota\sigma$ might be read as κ although it will be readily recognized that these two are easily confused. It appears to me that κ is, if not certain, at least equally possible. In view of this it would have seemed to me worthwhile to report Gallavotti's ingenious proposal to read $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\alpha\varsigma$, 'Άλκα', $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ πόλις, bold and uncertain as this may be.

On some matters of detail a few minor observations may give a measure of how hard the present reviewer has had to look to find defects. On Sappho 100 the apparatus attributes $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon} \rho' \epsilon\pi\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon$ to Bergk whereas Bergk, less well aware of Lesbian practice in regard to augment, actually proposed $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon} \rho\epsilon \pi\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon$. In Alcaeus 40, 2 there seems to be one too many brackets, if this should bother anyone. On Alcaeus 129, 4 I would call attention again to the suggestion, made in reviewing *P. Oxy.* XVIII, that the marginal note should be read $\zeta\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\langle\nu\rangle$ as a variant on $\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$. The fragments of Alcaeus numbered 252-82 were originally assigned to Sappho in *P. Oxy.* XXI and no reasons are here given for the reattribution. They are to be sought in *Sappho and Alcaeus*, p. 296. They are not conclusive. The attribution of 304 to Alcaeus is also far from being established with certainty. Some arguments for ascribing it rather to Sappho are advanced by Treu in his *Sappho Lieder*, pp. 161 ff. Alcaeus 357 is set in long lines that may be described as made up of two juxtaposed glyconics plus an iambic meter, as are also 358-60. It should have been pointed out that the papyri which preserve these lines present a different colometry, according to which the lines are divided into two, the first a hipponactean and the second a telesilleian plus iambic.

The usefulness of this edition is greatly increased by the addition of separate word indices for Sappho, Alcaeus, and the fragments *incerti auctoris*. These indices must, however, be studied carefully and used only in close conjunction with the texts. A check of one page of the index to Sappho will show why. On page 312 $\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$ is listed for 99 col. i₆ as a possible reading but it is not admitted into the text. $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\phi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\omega\varsigma$ is also listed for this same line, but without any warning *fort.*, although it appears neither in the text nor in the apparatus. $\iota\pi\acute{\alpha}$ is recorded for 44₁₃ and 17 although this is an abnormal poem and $\iota\pi'$ is what actually appears in the text. Under $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ *interrog.* $\tau\acute{\iota}$ is entered for 88(a) s. 12 *dub.* although what appears in

these places is $\tau\iota\varsigma$ and $\tau\iota\rho\alpha\delta$. Also one might wonder why, if $\xi\phi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ is listed as a conjecture on 48₂, Wilamowitz's $\xi\phi\lambda\nu\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ is not also registered.

Page's volume, which bears the title *Sappho and Alcaeus*, is described as *An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. It may, indeed, serve this purpose and serve it very well, but it is not an introduction in the conventional sense. It does not, i. e., give a systematic presentation of what is known and believed about Lesbian poetry. Instead it selects the "longer or otherwise more informative pieces of Sappho and Alcaeus" (p. v) and interprets them through translation and extended commentary. Part I, dealing with Sappho, presents twelve poems [1, 2, 5 + 15(b), 16, 17, 31, 44, 94, 95, 96, 98, and 137] in Section I and in Section II it deals with selected topics such as the number and contents of the books of Sappho, Aphrodite in the poems of Sappho, Lesbian society, and the character of Sappho. Part II is devoted to Alcaeus and covers the political poems in Section I with much attention to biography and chronology, the non-political poems in Section II with subsections on Gods and Goddesses, Heroes and Heroines, Women and Wine, Miscellaneous.

The texts are repeated in this volume, but with a great deal more licence in supplementing the papyri. The more extensive restoration here undertaken is, of course, offered only *exempli gratia* and claims no more than plausibility. This greater licence is fully justified since restoration of fragmentary texts must go hand in hand with their interpretation. The standards adhered to are still strict and differ from those of *L. P.* only in admitting what is plausible as well as what is virtually certain. The real question is whether *L. P.* is not unnecessarily rigid in excluding all supplements which are not virtually certain. Everyone knows how difficult it is to rid one's mind of the prejudice created by a plausible restoration once it has become familiar in print, but to refuse to admit any such supplements is a bit reminiscent of the psychology of the housewife who deposits money in the bank and then refuses to enter it on her account lest she spend it. The principle involved is, no doubt, psychologically sound but may be considered an evasion of the traditional duty of the editor of fragmentary texts as well as the assertion of a new principle. However this may be, it is only in fragment 17 of Sappho that any considerable amount of supplement is admitted and there only three of ten supplemented lines contain suggestions of Page. The extreme examples for Alcaeus are fragments 42 and 304. The first of these is the comparison of Helen and Thetis in which the familiar mythical subject matter is a good guide, and the second is the new fragment of a hymn to Artemis in which the familiar subject is again a guide as is also the familiar hymnic form and the reminiscences in Callimachus' hymn to Artemis.

The excellence of the work lies in the high quality of the annotation and interpretation. Not only is this work skilful and ingenious, containing even special studies such as that on Lesbian armor in connection with Alcaeus 357, but it rises at times to a high order of sympathy and insight. The interpretation of Sappho 1 would not seem to offer much of a field for reinterpretation but Page not only makes the poem live but makes it show Sappho in a new and

interesting light. The poem is, to be sure, cast in the form of a cult-song, a ritual-prayer, but it is anything but that; it is a very personal appeal to Aphrodite. More than that it shows a remarkably sophisticated detachment on the part of Sappho in picturing Aphrodite as smiling tolerantly at her own (Sappho's) fickleness. As Page puts it himself: "She can analyse her feelings, and pass judgment upon them, not without amusement at her own expense. And it is evident, here and elsewhere, that the talent which enables her thus to describe and criticize her deepest emotions dispassionately, allows her also to remember that she will be reciting her verses for the entertainment of her friends. She is seldom so absorbed in herself and her theme that she cannot pause to indulge some graceful fancy which is likely to amuse and interest her company" (p. 18). This observation is further generalized when he concludes that: "Wherever the evidence suffices for a judgment of her art, we find it to be the expression of a reflective, self-critical, and self-dramatizing personality" (p. 86). Yet his estimate of Sappho's poetic merit is not, in the end, high. "The modern estimate of Sappho as a lyrical poet of the highest order must still be founded, as heretofore, on two poems, ποικιλόθρον' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφρόδιτα and φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν. Recent discoveries have enhanced the reputation of Alcaeus; but additions to the text of Sappho have shown that much of her poetry was below the standard by which we were accustomed to judge her. It is questionable whether there is anything among the new fragments which reaches or even approaches the level of the old. We discern in both old and new the same narrow limitation of interests, the same simplicity of thought, the same delicacy in expression, the same talent for self-detachment and self-criticism. But whereas the two great poems are aglow in the reflection of intensely ardent emotions, the longer of the new fragments appear comparatively dispassionate and colourless. The language is not less elegant: the spirit is much less impassioned. Expectations were perhaps unreasonably high: Sappho's emotions were not permanently at fever-pitch; and the modern reader, if he seeks in the new fragments the suppressed fervour and refined sensuality of the old, is not likely to find anything but the image of his own prejudices" (p. 110).

As to Sappho's relationship to her companions Page writes a long *non liquet*, concluding that "It is at least probable that Lesbos in her lifetime was notorious for the perverse practices of its women: but in all that remains of Sappho's poetry there is not a word which connects herself or her companions with them, and at most half a word which reveals her awareness of their existence" (p. 144). This half a word is οἷσβ-, a slender foundation on which to build anything.

Again the factual and philological interpretation of Alcaeus is done in a masterful style. More general criticism is less freely expressed and one must look hard to find it. After passing the political poems in review Page expresses the following judgment: "We shall not judge that Mytilene lost a statesman of any good promise in one who struggled so long and so vainly against the stream of history. Alcaeus was for ever rushing headlong into battle, fighting for himself and his friends, and often he rushed

headlong out again. All through his stormy life he had neither might nor right on his side. There is little to admire in the man except his poetry; and of that there remains much to be seen, more varied in interest and perhaps often higher in quality" (p. 243). The virtues which he seems to find most admirable in Alcaeus are his versatility in writing different kinds of poetry on different subjects and his variety in treating the same theme.

Minor comments and questions occur to me at several points. In the commentary on the hymn to Aphrodite (p. 9) *δρῆμι* of 31, 11 is cited as an example of the first person singular of Lesbian *-μι* verbs corresponding to Attic contract verbs, and the translation of 31, 11 consistently gives "I see." Is it not equally possible that *α* rather than *ι* has been elided and that we have here the noun with suppressed copula rather than the verb? The meaning is not appreciably different, if *ὀπάτεσσι* is taken as a dative of reference, and there is even a slight advantage to be gained since the effect on Sappho's eyes will then be stated impersonally as the preceding items in the catalogue are. Page himself observes that "Sappho speaks of her own sensations as dispassionately as if she were an interested bystander."

Page discusses at some length the unsatisfactory character of the text (*κωὺκ ἐθέλοισα*), the variants and the emendations at Sappho 1, 24. In interpreting this passage he says (p. 15): "'Today she loves you not; tomorrow she shall love you even against her will.' Why 'against her will'? Because her love for you will then be unrequited; she will suffer as you suffer now, and she will pray for relief as you do today." This is very subtle interpretation but is the subtlety necessary? Although there is no evidence for a final *ν* on the participle I wonder if Blomfield's *ἐθέλοισαν* does not deserve consideration. Sappho herself has Aphrodite say at the beginning of this strophe "if she flees, she shall soon pursue," implying that the tables may be turned, making Sappho the *unwilling* object of pursuit. Or as Page paraphrases (p. 15), "Today it is she who runs from you; tomorrow it will be she who pursues, *you who seek to escape*." If we read the accusative of the participle the reversal of roles is made complete and Aphrodite says "she shall love you even against your will."

On page 165 in commenting on the construction of *κῆνων Ἐρίνυς* of Alcaeus 129, 14 Page cites Deubner's comparison of *πατρὸς Ἐρίνυς* in Aeschylus. A good Homeric parallel is to be found in *Od.*, λ 280 where Odysseus, in speaking of Jocasta, mentions *μητρὸς Ἐρίνυες*.

There is a peculiar confusion over the text, translation, and interpretation of Alcaeus 10, 4 (pp. 291 ff.). *L. P.* here reads *ὀνίατον* with the papyrus, but Page reads *ὀνίαρον* and translates "grievous." In the commentary, on p. 292, however, Page says "*ἀνίατος* here first (and alone in poetry, I think)," and in his interpretation on the following page, he translates, "incurable maiming." This contradiction apparently represents two different and unreconciled stages in the editor's thinking. I should think that *ὀνίαρον* had the better chance of being correct.

An appendix (pp. 318-26) gives a brief outline and analysis of the meters which occur in the fragments of the two poets, wherein Page is indebted, as he notes, to the recent studies of Miss Dale in

Classical Quarterly. This, at least, has the merit of avoiding much of the confusion inevitably attendant upon the employment of traditional terminology.

A "Note on the Dialect" (pp. 327-9) gives a very brief condensation of the facts about the most essential features of the two poets' Lesbian as presented more fully in $\Sigma\mu$. and $A\mu$.

On page 179, § 5, paragraph 2, for E 2 read E 3. On page 183 the reference to Z2. 2n. seems to be a false lead since no comment on $\kappa\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ is to be found at that point. In the index on page 331 in the next to the last line of the right-hand column for 134 read 135, on page 333 in the right-hand column opposite G2 for 298 read 198, and on page 339 under Hebrus for 285 read 286.

In reviewing new editions of Sappho and Alcaeus it is something of a temptation to review the poets rather than the editions and it would, perhaps, be a venial sin if one succumbed to such a temptation. Since, however, even the most recently recovered of the fragments were already published in 1952 such a review as this does not seem the appropriate place to indulge in interpretation and evaluation of the poems. As for the work of the editors, it has been done with the utmost care, skill, judgment, and taste. If imagination is not one of the qualities strongly represented in their work, this is a deliberate restraint. Perhaps Wilamowitz and others have exercised enough imagination in this field to last for several generations. In any case these two volumes will be used with confidence and satisfaction for years to come by serious students of Lesbian poetry.

LLOYD W. DALY.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

SCEVOLA MARIOTTI. *Il Bellum Poenicum e l'arte di Nevio*. Roma, Angelo Signorelli, 1955. Pp. 151. (*Studi e Saggi*; Collana diretta da Ettore Paratore.)

This book contains the most comprehensive study that has yet appeared of Naevius' epic. Yet, it does not do justice to the entire poem, for Professor Mariotti has chosen to concentrate his attention on the Archaeology or legendary part. The History or account of the first Punic war which gave the poem its name and occupies the larger part of it is treated much less thoroughly. Its relation to the Archaeology is the subject of some valuable observations and it is made to furnish its due share of illustrations for the discussion of Naevius' literary art. Nevertheless, some of the fundamental problems of the History are not examined in detail; for example, what it represents as historical writing and its relation to the work of Fabius Pictor (cf. Böhmer, *Symb. Oslo*, XXIX [1952], pp. 34 ff.). Moreover, although Mariotti shows in his edition of the historical fragments that he is rightly suspicious of some of the identifications of historical events made by Cichorius (*Röm. Stud.*, pp. 24 ff.), he does not give us the thorough new analysis that is now badly needed.

On the other hand, if there was to be concentration on a particular part of the poem, the choice of the Archaeology is readily understandable. Apart from its intrinsic interest as the earliest account in the Latin language of the story of Aeneas and the founding of Rome, it is relatively rich in fragments, a number of which, preserved in the D scholia of the Servian Corpus, are particularly informative and facilitate reconstruction (cf. Rowell, *A. J. P.*, LXXVIII [1957], pp. 1 ff. and *Y. C. S.*, XV, pp. 113 ff.). Modern scholarship, too, has centered on the Archaeology since 1935 when Ladislaus Strzelecki discerned that the *Bellum Punicum* did not begin with the Archaeology, but with the events of the opening years of the war.

An Archaeology that was an insertion or digression naturally raised new problems and called for the reexamination of older views. What was its *raison d'être* and its relation to the rest of the poem? How was the transition made from History to Archaeology? What literary precedents did Naevius have for such an arrangement? These were some of the questions that arose and by the answers given to them the concept of the inner organization of the Archaeology could not help but be affected.

Mariotti makes good use of the work of his predecessors. He laid the foundations of the present book in an article which was published in *Studi in onore di Gino Funaioli*, pp. 221 ff., a volume which was published in 1955, but seems to have been planned for 1953 (cf. Rowell, *A. J. P.*, LXXVII [1956], p. 428). This article with some slight changes is incorporated in the *Bellum Poenicum* as Chapter I and part of Chapter II.

The first chapter, "La struttura del *Bellum Poenicum* e l'arte alessandrina" (pp. 11-22), begins with a discussion of Greek works that might have influenced Naevius in his choice of a contemporary or almost contemporary historical event as the principal subject of his epic. The familiar figures appear: Choerilus of Samos, the authors of the *Πράξις Ἀλεξάνδρου*, and Rhianus of Bene but the discussion is too cursory to be very fruitful. Moreover, since the publication of *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* XI, 1399 it is rather hazardous to speak of Choerilus' poem simply as "la Perseide," as if it were an established fact that this was the title of the entire work (cf. Schmid-Stählin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, II, pp. 543 f.).

On the other hand, the pages that follow on certain characteristics of Hellenistic poetry which Mariotti discerns in the *Bellum Punicum* are thought out more carefully and command greater interest. First among them is the relative brevity of the Latin poem. Here Mariotti quite naturally makes a comparison with the *Argonautica* of Apollonius, a poem of about the same length as the *Bellum Punicum*. Moreover, he finds another point of comparison in the view that Naevius intended to unite the dominant characteristics of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in his single poem; that is, that the Punic war itself corresponds to the *Iliad*, the Archaeology to the *Odyssey*. Quite appropriately, too, he turns to Vergil, noting that in his symmetrical division of the *Aeneid* into the *errores* and the *maius opus*, the poet had a precedent in the *Bellum Punicum* dissimilar in organization and approach, but similar in its intention to reflect the fundamental subject matter of both Homeric epics. Fortunately, Mariotti does

not press his points too far and confesses that we cannot say for certain whether Naevius was familiar with the *Argonautica*. But the characteristics which it shares with the *Bellum Punicum* do not seem to him to be purely accidental.

In his second chapter, "Svolgimento e carattere dell'archaeologia Neviana" (pp. 25-47), Mariotti advances three hypotheses to account for the insertion of the Archaeology in the body of the poem: it was written to present 1, the parallel *origines* of Rome and Carthage; 2, the mythical *origo* of the first Punic war; 3, an *origo Romae*. Mariotti states his own opinion on p. 19: "l'archeologia di Nevio doveva essere una *Ῥώμης κτίσις* in cui l'*origo belli* entrava solo come episodio secondario."

To Mariotti this conclusion seems imposed by the location and character of frg. 17. It is specifically assigned to Book I of the *Bellum Punicum* by Servius Danielis on *Aeneid*, IX, 712 and reads *hanc* (Prochyta) *Naevius in primo Belli Punici de cognata Aeneae nomen accepisse dicit*. Mariotti compares it with a passage in the *Origo Gentis Romanae* (10) which certainly reflects Naevius and with frg. 18 of the *Bellum Punicum* which tells us that Naevius mentioned the Cimmerian Sibyl. From this evidence he draws the conclusion—and rightly I believe—that Naevius brought Aeneas to the bay of Naples in Book I. If, then, we assume that Naevius had Aeneas follow the same course in his wanderings that we find in Vergil, we shall have to conceive of a meeting between Dido and Aeneas that shared a place in Book I with the early years of the first Punic war, Aeneas' departure from Troy, a storm, a scene between Jupiter and Venus, an exhortation of Aeneas to his men, his arrival in the bay of Naples, his consultation with the Sibyl, and his burial of Prochyta. All this would certainly make an "episodio secondario" of a meeting between Dido and Aeneas. Yet Mariotti believes that such a meeting occurred in the *Bellum Punicum* and what is more, that an unhappy love affair between the founders of the two great nations that fought the historical war was presented by Naevius as the legendary *αἴτιον* of their later enmity.

But is it, we may ask, either reasonable or likely that so important an element occupied a secondary position? After all, the main subject of the *Bellum Punicum* was the first Punic war and we must attempt to establish some reasonable connection between it and the legendary part. I do not see where an Archaeology that was primarily an *origo Romae* would find its *raison d'être*. If Naevius like Ennius had written an annalistic account of Rome's history from the fall of Troy through the first Punic war, as Lucian Mueller believed (*Q. Ennii Carminum Reliquiae*, pp. XX ff.), the Archaeology would be a normal part of the whole. But this was not the case. On the other hand, if Naevius wished to trace the enmity between Rome and Carthage back to a quarrel between Aeneas and Dido, then the Archaeology can be explained as the setting within which the story of the two legendary protagonists developed.

I would not deny for a moment that Naevius was attracted by the story of the founding of Rome from Aeneas to Romulus. There was abundant material already on hand in Greek writers, in local legends, and in Fabius Pictor too, if he published the first part of his *History* before the *Bellum Punicum* was produced. But Naevius' interest in

telling it is one thing; his reason for inserting it in the narrative of the first Punic war is another. And this brings us back to aetiology and here only one *αἴτιον* can be reasonably conceived: a meeting of Dido and Aeneas that resulted in discord between them and their descendants.

Moreover, what of Naevius' chronology? He must have known as well as his contemporary Fabius Pictor that Rome according to Roman chronology was founded centuries after the fall of Troy. Fabius, *pace* Mommsen, filled in the gap with the Alban kings; Naevius made Romulus the grandson of Aeneas by a daughter (frg. 25). This genealogy makes it possible for Aeneas to have met Dido at about the time at which Timaeus places the founding of Carthage; that is, in 813 B. C. In other words, Naevius ignored any traditional date for the fall of Troy in favor of keeping Timaeus' date for the founding of Carthage and a Roman date for the founding of Rome. This to me is a clear indication of the importance which he placed on bringing Dido and Aeneas together.

Yet these general considerations appear to lose their validity before the evidence of frg. 18 that Aeneas was already at the bay of Naples in Book I; that is, if we continue to assume that Naevius made Aeneas follow the same course that we find in Vergil. But Leonardo Ferrero suggests that in Naevius Aeneas may have arrived in the bay of Naples before coming to Carthage (*Riv. ital. fil. class.*, XXVI [1948], p. 117). Mariotti considers this "un ripiego forzato" (p. 34). But why? There is no evidence that Aeneas reached Latium before Book III. Book II contains frg. 23, the famous *blande et docte percontat Aenea quo pacto/ Troiam urbem liquerit* which has often been assigned to Dido on the basis of *Aeneid*, I, 748 ff. Finally, with regard to a direct crossing from Italy to Carthage, it is worth observing that Vergil once had such a crossing of the Mediterranean by Aeneas in mind, for there are clear indications in the *Aeneid* that he originally planned to have him sail directly from Carthage to Cumae without landing in Sicily to celebrate the funeral games (cf. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*,³ p. 146, n. 1). If Naevius had depicted the Trojans as blown off their course to Carthage during their voyage from the bay of Naples to Rome, the second or central book of the Archaeology could have been devoted to Dido and Aeneas and the *αἴτιον* been fully developed that caused the Archaeology as a whole to be inserted in the historical poem.

The third chapter is entitled "Poesia greca 'classica' e miti greci nel *Bellum Poenicum*" (pp. 51-62). It contains observations on frgs. 10, 1, and 19. Starting with Macrobius (*Sat.*, III, 69, 5) who states that Naevius took his *vestis citrosa* (frg. 10) from the *εἴματα θνώδεα* of *Odyssey*, V, 264, Mariotti explains the Latin adjective by assuming that its author connected the first part of *θνώδης* not with *θύος* (incense) but with *θύον* (citron wood). He points out too that Livius Andronicus in his translation of the *Odyssey* may have preceded Naevius in this mistranslation.

With regard to frg. 1, *Novem Iovis concordēs filiae sorores*, Mariotti establishes its dependence on Hesiod, *Theog.*, 60; 76 rather than on Homer. In this he is right, although I cannot follow him or Leo in doubting that this line stood at the beginning of the *Bellum Punicum*. But it does not seem to me that Mariotti has evaluated

adequately this Hesiodic reflection. It was not so much a return to one of the ancient classics, although such a return it was, as the adoption of a trait in Alexandrine poetry that intentionally appealed to Hesiod and not to Homer, to Helicon and not to Olympus, as sources of inspiration. The matter has been well discussed by Erich Reitzenstein (*Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein*, pp. 23 ff.). Ennius, of course, followed the same tradition in his introduction to the *Annals*.

Frg. 19, assigned by Priscian to Book I, reads as follows: *Inerant signa expressa quomodo Titani/ bicorpores Gigantes magnique Atlantes/ Runcus ac Purpureus filii Terras*. For some time, a number of scholars including myself have assumed that the verses refer to the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum, that it was described by Naevius in connection with the siege and fall of that city in 262 B. C. and that the description of the temple which contained pediments, one of which portrayed a Gigantomachy, the other the fall of Troy, served as a means of transition from the History to the Archaeology. Recently, this hypothesis has been examined by Eduard Fraenkel (*J. R. S.*, XLIV [1954], pp. 14 ff.) who finds it more likely that the figures mentioned in the fragment were part of a description of a shield.

Mariotti influenced by Fraenkel's arguments is rather non-committal. He admits the possibility of the hypothesis which Fraenkel questions, yet feels that the relation between the fragment and the temple is too vague to support a strong assumption (p. 26). But here I would again emphasize two points in favor of the identification. The first is specific and is concerned with the *Atlantes*. We know of only one Atlas in mythology. In Fraenkel's opinion, the subjects of the *quo modo* clause are Runcus and Purpureus alone who are equated with a variety of enormous figures. Naevius would have recalled the huge figure of Atlas "and with a bold stroke added *magni Atlantes* to the list" (*op. cit.*, p. 15).

Mariotti (pp. 59 ff.) carefully examines Fraenkel's suggestion and reaches somewhat different conclusions. He takes *Titani*, *Gigantes*, and *Atlantes* as the basic subject, whereas Runcus and Purpureus would represent examples of outstanding combatants individualized within the entire group. The pluralization of Atlas would then not have been influenced by the two Giants and Titans in Naevius, but would rather have been an independent development of the kind that does not occur infrequently in connection with mythological figures. Mariotti also suggests that this pluralization might have taken place before Naevius in Greco-Italian legend. If Runcus is a popular Italic form of the Greek *Ῥῆκος* or *Ῥῆτος* and is not a transliteration of an otherwise unknown *Ῥύχως* as held by Hermann Fränkel (*Hermes*, LXX [1953], p. 60, n. 2), Mariotti's suggestion gains some weight.

I prefer Mariotti's interpretation of frg. 19. But I do not find his or Fraenkel's explanation of the plural *Atlantes* very convincing. In the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum a number of *Atlantes* were to be seen. They were huge figures that supported the entablature between the columns (cf. Krischen, *Arch. Anz.*, 1942, pp. 2 f.). Mariotti states quite rightly that they were not a part of the gigantomachy on the pediment (p. 26). But that is one thing and the impression

they could have made on the mind of Naevius is another. It seems to me that it was precisely the sight of so many *magni Atlantes* that gave Naevius the idea of treating them in the plural in describing the gigantomachy in the pediment.

And now to the second point, the siege and fall of Agrigentum. We know for certain that an event of 263 B. C. was described in Book I (frg. 32) and that the Archaeology began in the same book. Our next certain historical reference occurs in frg. 39, which is assigned in its source to Book IV. It describes an event of the year 257. Frg. 36, also assigned to Book IV, has been referred with great probability to an event of 260. But let us remain within the limits of certainty and state that at some point between 263 and 257, Naevius must have broken off the history of the war to begin the Archaeology. Now we have the right to assume that Naevius did not interrupt his history without due consideration for the flow of events. Wars too have their chapters and the first chapter of the first Punic war terminated with the fall of Agrigentum toward the end of 262 B. C. As Polybius tells us (I, 20), the Romans, elated by their success, abandoned their original plans and being no longer satisfied with having saved the Mamertines and with the advantages which they had already reaped, they began to entertain hopes of driving the Carthaginians out of Sicily. In other words, the first chapter of skirmish was over and the second chapter of full scale war to the bitter end was about to begin.

It would be difficult to find a more appropriate point between 263 and 257 than this turn of events for considering the original cause of the enmity between the two powers that were now on the point of beginning their mighty struggle for the western Mediterranean world. Let us recall that Naevius had probably witnessed a considerable part of the second Punic war when he began to write his epic on the first one in his old age. As we have seen, frg. 19 can be referred quite naturally to the gigantomachy in one of the pediments of the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum. Yet since Naevius was not writing a guide book to the monuments of Sicily, we can find a specific reason for this description only in the other pediment in which the fall of Troy was depicted, the scene with which his Archaeology very probably began. Here were the means and the moment to make the transition from the History to the Archaeology.

"La tradizione Latina" is the title of Chapter IV (pp. 65-86). It is essentially a study of the language and style of the *Bellum Punicum*. Making good use of the brief but valuable observations of Eduard Fränkel (*R.-E.*, Suppl. VI, cols. 638 f.), Mariotti undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the subject. In his pages on archaisms, I think he is right in assuming that Naevius used *Balatium* (frg. 27) and only *Balatium* for the Palatine and in seeing a false archaism in its use. But his interpretation of *virum praetor* in frg. 36 does not seem to me to hit the mark. He suggests that *virum* is a genitive and that Naevius had in mind the original meaning of *praetor* as "one who goes before" or "leader" rather than its later circumscribed use to designate a certain kind of magistrate. The Homeric *ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν* would have made its influence felt here. But given Naevius' use of *consul* in frg. 32, it is more natural to take *praetor* in its usual sense. There are also well-founded discus-

sions of such syntactical or stylistic devices as coordination of clauses, often in asyndeton, repetition of words and concepts, disparity in the use of tenses within the same passage, alliteration, and homoeoteleuton.

Perhaps of greater importance are Mariotti's views on the meter. In his *Livio Andronico* (pp. 32 f.), he had already expressed the opinion that the choice of the Saturnian meter by Andronicus had not been determined by a preexisting epic tradition. Rather, the fact that the Saturnian verse was the vehicle of early Latin oracular poetry as attested by Ennius, *Ann.*, 214, and that Greek oracles were almost always delivered in hexameters of a Homeric coloring, seemed to him to account sufficiently for Andronicus' use of the sacred and solemn Saturnian to render the Greek epic hexameter in Latin. He repeats this view in his *Bellum Poenicum* suggesting in addition that the Latin hexameter in a rude form was used for Latin oracles before Ennius. To me the evidence which Mariotti adduces does not justify this suggestion. But even if it were so, it contributes nothing to the solution of the problem of why Andronicus and Naevius chose to write their epics in Saturnian verses. Even if we believe with Mariotti that the hexameters attributed to the *Ino* of Andronicus (frg. 29a, Ribbeck³) are a later fiction, it is impossible to believe that he was incapable of writing Latin hexameters. And if he could handle this poetic form, what would have been more natural than to translate the *Odyssey* into it?

What we must find is a sound reason why he did not do so and we find it alone in the ancient *carmina de clarorum virorum laudibus* which are mentioned by Cato in his *Origines* (frg. 118 Peter² and the other testimonia gathered *ad loc.*). Mariotti admits their existence (*Livio Andronico*, p. 32), but will not concede that they exercised any influence on the early Latin epic. Instead, as we have seen, he assumes the influence of Saturnian oracles. But the *Odyssey* whether in Greek or in Latin translation was not an oracle but an epic, and its kinship lay with whatever heroic poetry the Romans already had. This was contained in the ancient *Carmina* and there is every reason to believe that they were composed in Saturnian verses, whether or not this form of verse was ultimately derived from Greek models (cf. Pasquali, *Preistoria della poesia Romana*, pp. 73 ff. and Eduard Fraenkel, *Eranos*, XLIX [1951], pp. 170 ff.).

To return now to Naevius and the book under review, Mariotti himself has given us an additional reason to believe that Naevius like Andronicus was influenced by the heroic *carmina* in his choice of the Saturnian meter. In his Chapter V entitled "I frammenti del *Bellum Poenicum*" (pp. 89-125), he adopts the view of Strzelecki that the original title of the poem before it was divided into books by C. Octavius Lampadio was *Carmen Belli Poinici* (or *Punici*). If this is so, and I think it very likely, we seem to have a clear indication that Naevius wished his epic to be considered a continuation of the native heroic poetry or perhaps, better yet, to belong within its traditional spirit. The Latin title of the translation of Andronicus was probably *Odusia* in its original form (cf. Knoche, *Gnomon*, IV [1928], p. 692). The title *Carmen Belli Poinici* would show at the outset that Naevius, his successor, had produced a truly Latin poem in the heroic manner, a direct descendant, albeit longer

and contrived with greater art, of the native *carmina*. And it was essential that it should be written in the same meter.

Mariotti's edition of the fragments (pp. 87-119) is very conservative. In handling the historical fragments, he assigns only those to Book IV-VII that are said to belong to them in their sources. This is a healthy reaction to some of Cichorius' reckless attributions. On the other hand, there are several instances in which the evidence from our historical sources (Polybius, Diodorus, Zonaras = Dio) give strong support to Cichorius' identifications of the fragments with specific historical events.

For example frg. 33, *fames acer augecit hostibus* is referred by Cichorius to the siege of Agrigentum in 262 B. C. Mariotti places it among the *incerta* (frg. 36 of his edition), recalling the opinion of Klussmann that it might refer to the siege of Palermo in 254. But the fact is that in our historical sources famine plays a conspicuous part only at the siege of Agrigentum. Consequently, Marmorale was quite right in attributing the fragment to Book I.

To specific books of the Archaeology Mariotti assigns twenty fragments and of these one to Books I or II and two to Books I, II, or III. In these twenty he includes six about which our sources merely state that Naevius was their author and three that are said to come from the *Bellum Punicum* without an indication of the book. Marmorale, on the other hand, assigns twenty-seven fragments to the Archaeology. Each fragment is followed by notes giving textual criticism, a scansion of the verse or verses, and references to other places in the present book or in the works of other scholars where the fragment has been discussed. Because of the brevity of these notes, much is left to be desired and this is the least satisfactory chapter.

As an appendix (pp. 129-44) Mariotti publishes a revised version of an article on the text of some of the dramatic fragments of Naevius in *Studi Urbinati*, s. B, XXIV (1950), pp. 174 ff. There is also a useful comparative table of the numbers assigned to the same fragments by Morel, Warmington, Marmorale, and Mariotti himself and an index.

Although much work still remains to be done on the *Bellum Punicum*, Mariotti's book represents an important step forward in the scholarship on this subject. In regard to the Archaeology in particular it brings us up to date on what has been done in the immediate past by others. At the same time it contributes much that is new and stimulating to our concept of the poem. On many points I have not been able to agree with the author; yet I have always profited by his discussion. He has faced the problems squarely and that is half the battle in reconstructing successfully a work of art from its scattered fragments.

HENRY T. ROWELL.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

E. G. TURNER, ed., with the collaboration in the edition of No. 198 of M.-T. LINGER. *The Hibeh Papyri, Edited with Translations and Notes*. London, Egypt Exploration Society, 1955. Pp. 187; 4 pls. (*Greco-Roman Memoirs*, No. 32.)

Grenfell and Hunt, the renowned masters in the field of papyrology, in the course of their explorations in Egypt in the early years of this century in search of papyri, carried out excavations in 1902 and 1903 at the Egyptian village of El-Hibeh, during which the major portion of the Egypt Exploration Society's Hibeh collection—the major portion of these, in turn, consisting of cartonage—was found. The remainder of the collection was acquired by purchase. With the notable exception of No. 198—which, while bought at Illahun, did not come from the Fayum—these papyri were bought in the Fayum, but are known to have come from El-Hibeh. The ultimate provenance of the papyri in the collection, likewise, seems clear. While a few items came from the Arsinoite nome and the Heracleopolite nome, and No. 198 came from some place on the Nile between Memphis and Hermopolis, the following considerations seem to show that by far the larger part of the papyri originated in Oxyrhynchus. The prominence of the literary material makes it clear that the cartonage—for which the papyri in the collection were employed in greater part—came from a library of classical literature. Certain items (*P. Hib.*, I, 16, 17, 26; II, 182-4, 188, 189) seem to have derived from a philosophical library, presumably a part of the classical library just mentioned or of another library, still, that was devoted more especially to philosophy. Since most of the Ptolemaic papyri in the collection came from Oxyrhynchus, Grenfell and Hunt were inclined to believe (*P. Hib.*, I, p. 12)—Professor Turner agrees (*P. Hib.*, II, p. v) with them—that the literary papyri, as well, came from that place, a most appropriate attribution in view of Oxyrhynchus' standing as a center of literary studies. See the recent article of E. G. Turner, "Roman Oxyrhynchus," in *J. E. A.*, XXXVIII (1952), pp. 78-93, especially pp. 92-3.

The better preserved and more important papyri of the collection (with the exception of No. 198) were promptly published in 1906 by Grenfell and Hunt. Now, forty-nine years later, the remainder of the collection that is worthy of publication (very many fragments still remain unpublished) has been edited with the scholarship we expect of the General Editor of the *Greco-Roman Memoirs*, Professor E. G. Turner, with the collaboration in the edition of No. 198 of Mlle. Linger, whose name also appears on the title-page of the book. Additional assistance recorded by the editor includes valuable contributions of other scholars, still, notably Professor T. B. L. Webster, Mr. T. C. Skeat, and Dr. John Barns. The editor also records his "good fortune to find transcriptions of a score or so of texts made by Grenfell and Hunt." The fragmentary condition of the papyri in the second volume appears not only in the printed texts, but more strikingly still in the frequent recurrence of the words "scraps" and "sorry scraps" in the editor's descrip-

tions of the physical condition of the various papyri. Grenfell and Hunt had indicated (*P. Hib.*, I, p. 10) the possibility of making something of value out of numerous small literary fragments, "if they can be fitted together," and Professor Turner has done this, with assistance which he credits to Dr. Barns. It is much to the credit of the editor that, with material in such poor condition, he has produced a volume which contains so much of value, as this volume does, especially in legal matters (in No. 198), in Alexandrian lexicography, and in connection with the techniques employed by Alexandrian literary men. One further comment, of a general nature, may be made concerning the work of the editor. There is much speculation in the volume—but it is always labelled as such. Moreover, it is, one may say, disciplined speculation of the sort that may lead to ultimate advance in our knowledge.

The dates and the types of the texts included in the volume are shown most conveniently by the headings of the main sections of the volume, as follows: I. New Classical Fragments (Nos. 172-92); II. Extant Classical Authors (Nos. 193-5); III. Documents of the Ptolemaic Period (Nos. 196-214); IV. Documents of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (Nos. 215-20); V. Minor Unidentified Literary Texts (Nos. 221-32); VI. Minor Documents: (a) Ptolemaic (Nos. 233-71); (b) Roman (Nos. 272-84); Indices.

The following cursory notes will give some indication of the nature of the material in this concluding volume of the Hibe Papyri. No. 172, assigned by the editor to the period *ca.* 270-230 B. C., is an onomasticon with the general characteristics of a *Gradus ad Parnassum*, containing poetical epithets (all compound adjectives) from choral lyric, tragic lyric, and epic. Professor Turner aptly calls attention to the fact that the onomasticon throws interesting light on the "methods and techniques of the Alexandrian poets," and goes on to offer the suggestion that it may have formed an appendix to the dictionary of Philetas. The number of new words in the onomasticon, 37, in the proportion of one to four of words already attested—*addenda lexicis* are prefixed by an asterisk in the Indices to *P. Hib.*, II—provides a significant indication of the amount of Greek poetry that has not survived. Turner would see in No. 173, a very fragmentary comparison of Archilochus and Homer, "an earlier stage of the anthology" of Chrysippus. No. 175, consisting of two scraps of a very fragmentary lexicon which the editor assigns to the period *ca.* 260-240 B. C., is one of the three earliest extant Greek lexicographical works. The other two are: (1) *P. Hib.*, I, 5 verso + *P. Ryl.*, I, 16a + *P. Baden*, VI, 180; and (2) *P. Hib.*, II, 172. No. 182, written *ca.* 280-250 B. C., contains apophthegms of Socrates and some account of his life. Turner offers the suggestion that Diogenes Laertius' story (II, 34) of Socrates and Xanthippe inviting certain wealthy men to dinner comes from sources whose authority is to be found in this papyrus. It is also worthy of note that the literary form of the ἀποφθέγματα as it appears in this papyrus and elsewhere, consisting of a mixture of biography and sayings influenced by the dialogue, displays various interesting resemblances with the *Logia* of Jesus. See T. Klausner and P. de Labriolle, "Apophthegm," in *Real-lexikon für Antike und Christentum*, I (1950), pp. 545-50, especially pp. 547-9.

No. 183 contains a treatise concerning words properly admitted into poetry; it is probably part of a larger work on poetry. Since the vocabulary resembles Aristotle's, the author is presumed by Turner to be one of Aristotle's students. Possibly important conclusions are to be drawn from the papyrus concerning certain passages in the works of Aristotle himself. Proceeding from a restoration of lines 9-10 (that is not altogether conclusive)—which, as restored, would mention eight parts of diction, the number mentioned by Aristotle—the editor concludes that certain sections of the *Poetics* that are often regarded as interpolations (more particularly, chap. 20) should probably be regarded as the work of Aristotle. No. 184 seems to be a student's notebook containing exercises written out as he worked through a textbook on logic. No. 185 contains an ethnographical work which, the repeated references to precious stones would show, dealt with the Orient, especially with Arabia or India.

Owing to resemblance of the document in subject matter and in order of treatment to Theophrastus' *Historia Plantarum*, II, vii, 6-7—which deals with the cultivation of almonds—the editor's assumption seems justified that No. 187, composed ca. 280-240 B. C., is "either an abridgement or adaptation of Theophrastus made for practical purposes; or an independent representation of the class of practical manual on which Theophrastus himself drew." For such manuals, reference may be made to R. Johannesen, "Ptolemy Philadelphus and Scientific Agriculture," in *C. P.*, XVIII (1923), pp. 156-61; M. Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B. C.* (*University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences*, VI [Madison, 1922]), p. 96. Beside No. 187, only one other practical handbook of this sort has been found in Egypt—*P. S. I.*, VI, 624. Both of these documents survive in very fragmentary condition, consisting, each, of about 20 lines. No. 196, of the period ca. 280-250 B. C. and consisting of some twenty lines, Turner suggests, contains "... extracts from a 'city law' of one of the Greek cities of Egypt. Alexandria itself is a possibility. . . ." These extracts have to do with the duties of a γυναικονόμος, an official not hitherto attested for Egypt and possibly introduced from Athens at the time of Demetrius of Phalerum, since the laws of Alexandria may have been based on those of Athens (see *P. Oxy.*, XVIII, 2177, 13-14 [third century, A. D.] and the introductory comments on p. 96; reference should now be made also to the discussion of this papyrus by H. A. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum* [Oxford, 1954], pp. 196-7) and since it was only at the time of Demetrius that these officials existed at Athens. No. 197 consists of very fragmentary portions, either of προστάγματα or πολιτικοὶ νόμοι that deal with the procedures of ἐνεχυράσῃα and ἐμβαδεία in the attachment of property. Especially noteworthy is an ἐπίκρισις limited to the examination of property (ἐπίκρισις γῆς ἢ οἰκιῶν κτλ.).

No. 198, by far the most substantial document in the volume, is not cartonnage from excavations at El-Hibeh and, since it was added to the collection through purchase, instead, its provenance is not definitely known. Nevertheless, the internal evidence—the applicability of the long διάγραμμα in cols. iv-vi to places on the Nile and the numerous citations of towns located on the river—make a prove-

nance on the Nile somewhere between Memphis and Hermopolis fairly probable. Likewise, as to date there is no certainty; as in the instance of most other documents in the volume, the editors have had to rely upon palaeographic evidence and, in this instance, upon a limited amount of prosopographical evidence. Briefly stated, their conclusions as to the date of No. 198 are that (1) the 4th year of *recto* col. i must be the 4th year of Ptolemy Philadelphus (282/1 B. C.); (2) the documents on the *recto* were written during the later years of Philadelphus' reign, perhaps *ca.* 260-250 B. C.; and (3) the 5th year of the last ordinance on the *verso* must be the 5th year of Ptolemy Euergetes, and, therefore, the *terminus post quem* of the *verso* is April/May, 242 B. C. The ordinances on both the *recto* and the *verso*—in the main, *προστάγματα*, but a *διάγραμμα* and an *ἐντολή* also appear—pertain to the royal administration and add much new information to our knowledge of Ptolemaic legislation, especially in connection with the penal system and the security of navigation. For similar Ptolemaic enactments, to which No. 198 provides valuable supplements, see M.-T. Lenger, "Les lois et ordonnances des Lagides," in *Chronique d'Égypte*, XIX (1944), pp. 108-46. Quite appropriately, Professor Turner associated Mlle. Lenger with himself in the editing of this important document.

The following contributions of No. 198 to our knowledge of Ptolemaic legislation are especially worthy of note. Lines 85-105 deal with the regulation of the responsibilities of the *φυλακῖται* in penal matters. Lines 86-7 attest the retention in the Ptolemaic period of the New Kingdom Egyptian practice of branding captives and slaves with the hot iron. Disagreement between the editors concerning the interpretation of *ἐνοχοὶ . . . φωρῶν βασι[λ]ικῆν*, in lines 91-2, results in some very interesting speculation on p. 100. Mlle. Lenger, reading *φώρα* paroxytone and construing it (as Hesychius did) as *ἐρευνα*, would render the phrase as "subject to investigation by the crown," and assume therefrom "a criminal investigation department in the government." *Φὼρ βασιλικός* Mlle. Lenger would consider "a kind of crown detective," following Hesychius' construction of *φὼρ* as *κατάσκοπος*. Turner, on the other hand, would read *φωρά* oxytone, construing it in the sense of *κλοπή*, as Hesychius did, and would render the phrase as "liable to penalties for the offence of theft from the crown." *Φὼρ βασιλικός* Turner would, therefore, construe as "thief from, or criminal against, the crown." From lines 95-6 we learn that the same penalty was imposed upon both accomplice and principal. Lines 110-22 bring important new information concerning the regulation and provision of security of navigation on the Nile: there was to be no sailing by night and mooring was to be at places specified by the *φυλακῖται*. The evidence concerning provisions for safety of navigation and prevention of piracy on the Nile was collected by M. Rostovtzeff ("*Πλοῖα Θαλάσσια* on the Nile," in *Études dédiées à la mémoire d'André M. Andréadès* [Athens, 1940], pp. 367-76; *idem*, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* [Vols. I-III, Oxford, 1941], II, p. 715; III, pp. 1494-5), who found no evidence on the subject antedating the second century B. C., but predicted that it would be found. Lines 110-22 of No. 198 fulfill his prediction. Lines 154-60 contain the earliest extant text dealing with the death

penalty. The editors suggest that the penalty specified in these lines was applicable to the malfeasance of various officials. The very probable restoration of τὸν ἐν ἐκάστ[ωι νομῶι στρατη]γὸν in lines 242-3 has important repercussions as to the date when the strategos became the chief administrative officer of the nome, requiring a date either near the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes (ca. 27 January, 246 B. C.), or, more probably, during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-246 B. C.). These dates are earlier than the date assigned to this change in the function of the strategos by H. Bengtson (*Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit*, III, pp. 32-5 [*Münchener Beiträge*, XXXVI; Munich, 1952]), who placed it after the middle of the third century on the basis of *P. Col. Zen.*, II, 120, which, dated in 229/8 B. C., he regarded as attesting a recent development.

No. 199 fixes the date of the establishment of the cult of Ptolemy Philadelphus and Arsinoe in the 14th year of Philadelphus' reign (272/1 B. C.) at the latest, confirming thereby the surmise of Grenfell and Hunt, in *P. Hib.*, I, p. 272. The document numbered 200 seems to be of a type not often found in the papyri, being a μαρτυρία, or deposition. No. 203 is notable for the use of ἀντέντευξις—hitherto not attested—in the sense of "counter-petition," "summons," or "subpoena." No. 208, assigned to the period ca. 270-250 B. C. by the editor, confirms the contention of H. J. Wolff (*Written and Unwritten Marriages in Hellenistic and Post-Classical Law* [Haverford, Pa., 1939], pp. 20-4), that the συγγραφὴ ὁμολογίας in its earlier stages of development concerned the dowry, while, in later times, it attested the marriage itself. Only one other extant marriage contract is earlier in date than No. 208: the well-known contract in *P. Eleph.*, 1, which is dated in 311 B. C. The papyrus now published as No. 210 has already been cited by Grenfell and Hunt, in *P. Hib.*, I, p. 205, to establish the tenure of the office of oeconomus of a toparchy in the Arsinoite nome by a certain Zenodorus. Further substantiation of their view is now forthcoming from *P. Hamb.*, II, 183, where Zenodorus is referred to as oeconomus of "the lower <toparchy> and Thmoisepho." And in *P. Hib.*, II, 240 he is probably the man to whom, in his capacity as oeconomus and toparch, a ὑπόμνημα is addressed. No. 211 employs a new word: μανδράρχης, "stable-master." Two new words, possibly the names of classes of priests or workers, appear in No. 213: κυνοτάφος and λυχνοδότης. No. 215 adds new evidence to our knowledge concerning the career of Tiberius Julius Alexander, that after his tenure as Prefect of Egypt, he was appointed *praefectus praetorio*. Possible reasons for this promotion are discussed by E. G. Turner, "Tiberius Julius Alexander," in *J. R. S.*, XLIV (1954), pp. 54-64. No. 217 records the sale, by two men of Ancyronon, of column-drums, bases, and capitals which were probably quarried at Ancyronon (where limestone quarries are known to have been located) and thereby confirm the identification of El-Hibeh with Ἀγκυρώνων or Ἀγκυρῶν πόλις, which was suggested by Grenfell and Hunt, in *P. Hib.*, I, p. 10, and first established with some assurance of certainty by F. Bilabel, in *P. Baden*, IV, p. 7; *idem*, "Der griechische Name der Stadt El-Hibeh," in *Philologus*, LXXVII, Neue Folge XXXI (1921), pp. 422-5.

No. 219, dated 309 A. D., provides new evidence concerning the tax called ἀναβολικόν. The papyrus contains a declaration of amounts of articles to be made by the linen-weavers of Ancyronon during the year 309/10 A. D. in satisfaction of an assessment that had been made upon them. Proceeding from this papyrus, in conjunction with other documents, Turner offers the suggestion that the ἀναβολικόν was levied in two stages: (1) collection of flax at the amount assessed upon a fixed unit of land (see *P. S. I.*, VII, 779; *P. Thead.*, 34, col. III); (2) distribution of flax to the weavers, for them to turn into finished articles (in *P. Ryl.*, IV, 654, 7 it is said of a λιγούφος and his σύνεργος that τῷ γὰρ ἀναβολικῷ πλίστα συντελοῦσιν. For this passage, see now A. D'Ors, "P. Ryl. 654 y el 'anabolicum,'" in *Studi in onore di Ugo Paoli* [Florence, 1955], pp. 259-67). No. 220 records an interesting payment of hay, made in 335 A. D. by the comarchs of Ancyronon to the superintendents of the public bakeries at Babylon, ὑπὲρ μερζισμοῦ ἔργατῶν ἡμερῶν εἰς καὶ ὑπὲρ τροφείου. Among the "Minor Unidentified Literary Texts" (Nos. 221-32), No. 228 was, an "addendum" slip informs us, identified "At the very moment of publication"; it has now been published by E. G. Turner, "A Ptolemaic Scrap of Plato, *Sophistes*," in *Rh. Museum*, Neue Folge XCVIII (1955), pp. 97-8. On p. 165 the volume number of *T. A. P. A.* in which H. C. Youtie's article was published should be 81, instead of 82. No. 282 exhibits the word δειοβολοῦντα, which has not been attested hitherto and which, employed in the description of a procedure that came before the sowing (δειοβολοῦντα τὴν βολοσιροφίαν), contradicts the interpretation of μονοβολεῖν by M. Sehnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten* (*Münchener Beiträge*, VII [Munich, 1925]), pp. 134-5; cf. *L. S. J.*, s. v. μονοβολέω, "undertake sowing without assistance."

JOHN DAY.

BARNARD COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

ANDRÉ MARTINET. Économie des changements phonétiques. Berne, A. Francke, 1955. Pp. 396. 26 Sw. fr.; 29.50 (bound). (*Biblioteca Romanica*, ser. 1, Vol. X.)

This volume is a landmark in historical linguistics. It is the first full-scale exposition of that structural approach to comparative work which has been developing so rapidly on both sides of the Atlantic during the past decade. It is, moreover, a very clear, sane, constructive account of these methods, illustrated by numerous detailed applications to different problems and languages.

In a sense, the book is not new. More than half of it has appeared before, largely in English, in such journals as *WORD*, *Language*, *Romance Philology*, etc. But this is not a mere collection of revised articles; the book is an integrated whole, divided into two sections. The first, called *Théorie générale*, extends through page 195, and is, therefore, slightly less than half of the book. It is this part which contains the most new and radically rewritten material; when old

material appears here, it is generally in the form of a paragraph or two imbedded in a new and fuller context, or, conversely, a frame in which many new sections have been inserted. The second part, called *Illustrations*, contains only one chapter which, so far as I know, has not been published in any form before (10, on the Great Vowel Shift in English). The amount of revision involved in this second part varies considerably; some chapters are incorporated with only trivial changes, others with considerable rewriting and addition of new material, though nowhere on the scale of the first part. The chapters (in the second part) of most interest to readers of this journal will probably be 8 (*Non-apophonic O-vocalism in IE*," from *WORD*, IX [1953], pp. 253-67), 9 (revised and expanded from "Slavic and Aryan Reflexes of IE S," *WORD*, VII [1951], pp. 91-5) and 13, II (slightly rewritten from "Some Problems of Italic Consonantism," in *WORD*, VI [1950], pp. 26-41), though the others, dealing with Celtic, Romance, and Basque are fascinating reading even for those who are unfamiliar with the fields.

The other topics treated in part II include infection in Irish (the development of consonants with velar, labial, and palatal color as distinct phonemes from an earlier state in which they were conditioned by the adjacent vowels [7]), Celtic lenition (the development of a contrast between weak and strong consonants [11, I]), the consonants of Western Romance (and the possibility of a Celtic substratum influence on their development [11, II and III]), the unvoicing of the Spanish sibilants (and the development of the consonant system in general, partly with reference to a possible Basque substratum [12]), open syllables in Slavic (13, III), and Basque occlusives (14). Part I is divided into Introduction, Function, Structure, Economy, Prosody, and Conclusion. The chapter on Function (2) is concerned mainly with the influence of changes in one part of a phoneme system on other parts, Structure (3) with the general principles of analyzing phonemes in terms of their oppositions into orders and series, Economy (4) with details of different possible types of correlations or oppositions and the factors which make for greater or less stability, as well as some general lines of phonemic development, while Prosody (5) deals with the special behavior of such elements as quantity, stress and pitch in linguistic systems.

There is naturally some risk when a linguist, because of the breadth of his problem, is forced to depend in part on secondary sources; Martinet may not have escaped this danger entirely, but so far as I am competent to judge, at least, he has not been led to any wholly false conclusions by such use of secondary sources. My criticisms will be more of details than of principles or general conclusions.

I cannot feel convinced that Italic or Indo-European of any period was quite as free from any sort of inter-word juncture 'phoneme' as modern French is (p. 341); the implication (p. 348) that single intervocalic -r- in Latin was a multiple-tap trill, rather than a single flap, seems dubious. Benveniste's theory of a unitary sibilic-velar series of phonemes (accepted by Martinet, p. 230) strikes me, on several grounds, as a wee bit unlikely, not to say preposterous. If the laryngeals are to be integrated into the IE phonemic system

(and it is to Martinet's credit that he attempts to do this [in 8], at least in part), all the evidence must be considered. As Kurylowicz points out (*L'apophonie en Indo-européen*, pp. 168-9) the distribution of the laryngeals appears to resemble primarily that of the stops and s, only secondarily that of the sonants. But if they were once fricatives (and nearly everyone seems to assume that some of them were) it should be noted that the voicing contrast in IE did not (apparently) apply to /s/; [s] and [z] were allophones. Yet most laryngealists postulate at least one phonemically voiced laryngeal (a non-significantly voiced phoneme cannot condition voicing in a neighboring phoneme). This is mainly to account for *pibati* (partly also to account for the h vs. hh spelling contrast in Hittite). Now it seems improbable in the extreme that a language can exist with a phonemic x vs. γ contrast, but without s vs. z. Hockett (*Manual of Phonology*, pp. 104-26) does not know of any, though the converse is quite frequent. We are led to conclude that if any or all laryngeals were fricatives, either (a) they had no phonemic voicing, and *pibati* must be explained differently, or (b) phonemic /z/ existed also at the same time.¹

If this is so, and it was later lost, may it not be one of the 'laryngeals'—perhaps a fifth or sixth? It should not be too difficult to find an etymology or two correlating s with a (voiced) laryngeal. Martinet appears to suppose at least five laryngeals: an o-colored voiced, an o-colored voiceless, an a-colored aspirate, an a-colored non-aspirate, and at least one e-colored or colorless. These could all be integrated without difficulty as fricatives in a variety of ways. Suppose α_1 (?) = /θ/, α_2 (x, part of M.'s A) = /x/, α_3 (γ, M.'s voiced A^w) = /β/, α_4 (h, M.'s A) = /x/, and Martinet's voiceless A^w = /φ/. (This does not imply retention of laryngeals in all places proposed by some laryngealists.) This supposes that Kurylowicz is right in postulating only two dorsal orders, a velar and a post-velar, which led to Eastern palatal and velar, but to Western velar and labiovelar respectively, so the o-colored 'laryngeals' would probably be labials, since labio-velars didn't yet exist, and the a-colored 'laryngeals' are respectively velar and post-velar. The lone voiced laryngeal² would simultaneously account for the rarity of /b/ in IE. It was weakened (past re-strengthening) into α_3 or sometimes w (as suggested by Martinet), whereas the voiced correlates of θ, x, x were δ, γ, γ, which yielded (in West European) d, g, and g^w respectively. At this period, then, the true voiced (or lenis, or glottalized, or whatever the correlation may have been) correlates of p t k k, were what later became bh, dh, gh, gh^w.

When the voiceless laryngeals were all weakened to h (or glottal stop?), their voiced partners (except β), being left partially out of the system, hardened into stops. And simultaneously, the earlier plain voiced stops, in order to maintain their distance from these

¹ Sturtevant, chiefly on the basis of the smooth breathing in *eu* 'well' in Greek, assumes a phonemic /z/ in IE after the loss of the laryngeals, conditioned like the b of *pibati*.

² This scheme provides no place for /z/, which would be a sixth laryngeal characterized probably by (a) voicing, (b) e-color or lack of color, (c) non-aspiration.

new voiced stops, were further strengthened by the element we write as aspiration (perhaps phonetically a forcible voiced release combined with husky or hoarse onset of the following vowel). (The theory that the 'voiced aspirates' were all clusters is implausible on grounds of relative frequency.) It seems at least possible that the voiced fricative allophones or reflexes of voiced stops existing in some modern European languages may be in part continuations of early IE articulations. The various rearrangements of the obstruent series in the branches of IE, including the Germanic consonant shift, would then be all ultimately initiated by the instability resulting from the loss of the voiceless fricatives ('laryngeals').

If, on the other hand, we cannot assume that IE ever had a distinct *z* phoneme, we would be strongly tempted to reject phonemically voiced laryngeals in general. Then the proposed fricatives would be allophonically voiced under the same conditions as *s*. If we reject fricatives entirely, we have several possibilities: (1) the 'laryngeals' were in fact prosodic features, applying to vowels and sonants—say glottalization for one, breathiness for another, length for a third, and pharyngalization and nasalization (which would be required for Sturtevant's change of *Hw* to *m*); (2) they were vowels, and the 'vowelless' reconstruction of IE is right, except that what it terms 'laryngeals' should be called 'vowels' instead; (3) they were syllable initiators (and perhaps closers) of the normal *h*, *ʔ*, zero pattern (which could be integrated as an order); (4) they were unintegrated phonemes, sharing no features with one another or with any of the other IE phonemes—one perhaps a fricative, another a prosodic feature, a third a syllable initiator and so on. Something like this last has been a favored solution until now, though it seems to be contradicted by the similar effects postulated for the different laryngeals. Martinet has shown the importance of the problem and made a partial attempt at integration, whatever we may think of his solution. Velten has recently objected (in *For Roman Jakobson*, pp. 585-7) to the implication of Martinet that there is no upper limit to the number of 'laryngeals' we may justifiably reconstruct, and favors a reduction to two, *h* and *ʔ*. I find the *ʔ* a little awkward to handle or understand in this situation, but would incline to accept *h* as a certain decay product, before final loss, which might come from several earlier sources, as in Greek and Spanish (of different times and regions). In another passage (p. 306) Martinet is skeptical about the normalcy of a change *f* > *h*, and invokes a Basque substratum to help account for it, but he is quite happy about *ϕ* > *h*, and on p. 382 cites Irish and Faroese for the shift *θ* > *h*. Certainly, then, it is likely that at one period IE had 5 or 6 "laryngeals," later perhaps two or three (say /*ϕ*/, /*θ*/, /*x*/), still later only one (*h*), before final loss.

If we turn next to the chapter (9) on the developments from IE *s*, we find ample illustrations of the value of the structural approach to such problems. The variety of ways in which allophonic differences can become phonemic, especially as reinforced by other shifts in the consonant system, so that a *s*:*š* contrast now exists (independently developed) in a great part of the modern IE domain, is fascinating to examine. One may hesitate a little about the correlations of articulation with acoustic effect given or implied on pp.

235-6; both 'apical' and 'pre-dorsal' sibilants can equally be more or less palatal or hushing in quality, and ʃ itself may be either 'apical' (especially if retroflexed) or 'predorsal.' But this oversimplification of the articulatory situation in no way vitiates Martinet's discussion.

The chapter on Italic consonantism is a valuable one for the classical linguist. However much we may disagree in detail, it is abundantly clear that there is no phonological reason (as there is also no valid lexical or morphological one) for denying the close kinship of Oscan-Umbrian with Latin-Faliscan. One detail with which we may disagree is his supposition of a general weakening of *all* obstruent consonants, followed by a general strengthening. In fact, there is no evidence of either phenomenon affecting the plain voiceless stops, nor does a structural view require us to assume such a process extending to them; it is sufficient to postulate it for the fricatives and voiced stops—those phonemes, in short, which were phonemically voiced or which had voiceless as well as voiced allophones. Indeed, if the view suggested earlier in connection with laryngeals, that the IE mediae were originally fricative and continued to have some fricative allophones in certain branches (including Italic), is correct, then it is precisely this common feature which is involved in the successive weakening and strengthening shifts of Italic and Latin.

The linguist, if not the classicist, will be especially interested in Martinet's treatment of distinctive features and his opposition to complete "binarism"—i.e. the principles of Roman Jakobson and his followers. In his general stand, Martinet is very close to Hockett (in his recent *Manual of Phonology*), Voegelin (in various recent articles on typology), and other American linguists. For the uninitiated, the Jakobson position is approximately this: in any language, phonemes are distinguished from one another by various features (voicing, aspiration, nasality, etc.) which can all be reduced (by the method of complementary distribution) to a short list (about 10, ordinarily) of *distinctive* features, such that each phoneme can be completely defined by a statement indicating which of these ten (or so) features it has and which it lacks (hence 'binary,' yes-or-no choice). Now Martinet (and other linguists) have little difficulty in accepting this notion for pairs in which it is easy to see a sort of articulatory additive difference: $p:b = t:d = f:v$, for instance, can often be easily interpreted as the *addition* of voicing to voiceless phonemes. In the case of vowels, too, it is not too difficult to interpret $i:ü = e:ö$ as the addition of rounding to front vowels—though here Martinet often seems to be skeptical. But a binary equation of the type $p:k = t:ç$, for instance, is not obviously such an additive relation. For Martinet (as for many others) the difference between p and k is absolute, like that between you and me; they are distinct individuals (of the same series-class, to be sure) but otherwise unrelated. And this attitude seems to be supported by the consideration of articulation: p is articulated with the lips, k with the back of the tongue, and that is that. Jakobson, on the other hand, appeals to acoustic data (as shown most clearly in sound spectrograms) to argue that p and (velar) k (like back vowels) tend to have a relatively low second formant (concentration of power between 600 and

1600 cps), while *t* and *č* have a high one; and that *č* and *k* begin with a concentrated region of power (one formant, often a pulling together of F_2 and F_3 or F_3 and F_4) whereas *p* and *t* have from the outset a more diffuse spectrum (with separate F_1 , F_2 and F_3 power). A slightly different pair of binary contrasts can be used for a set like *p:t* = *k^w:k*, or the common African *p:t* = *kp:k*, where even from an articulatory point of view some relation seems possible. All these 'binary' analyses Martinet rejects, so that while his orders (e. g. *p*, *b*, *m*) may be analyzed with binary contrasts, his series (e. g. *p*, *t*, *k*, *q*) are composed of absolute and unanalyzable entities. Part of his skepticism is clearly due to insufficient familiarity with acoustic phonetics; no one should nowadays quote seriously (even to reject) such nonsense as Martinet cites from Grammont on page 68 (that *u*, *o*, *a*, *e*, *i* form a series in which each vowel is characterized by a formant frequency twice that of its predecessor). That the data of spectrographic analysis can only confirm articulatory evidence is an exaggeration, at best, though perhaps forgivable from an articulatory phonetician of such skill as Martinet.

In his treatment of vowels, Martinet is never quite sure how much binarity is acceptable; in some passages one has almost the feeling that all vowels are unanalyzable absolutes, but elsewhere (e. g. pp. 69-70) he speaks of orders and series for vowels (though somewhat as if it were not really so, but only a figure of speech). In doing this, he seems actually to misapply the analogy, so that his vowel *orders* (e. g. the French high vowels *i*, *ü*,) are more like consonant *series* (e. g. stops) than orders (e. g. labials), and his vowel *series* (front vowels, *i*, *e*, *ɛ*) are more like consonant orders (apicals, for instance), from an articulatory point of view as well as an acoustic one. In fact, if a language has a palatalized order (*t'*, *đ*, *ń*) it is easy to add a *y* (cf. p. 83 on Castilian) and an *i*; similarly *w* (and *u*) go naturally with a labialized velar order (*qu*, *gu*, *xu*) as in Proto-Latin (cf. p. 340), especially if (as in Latin) *w* and *u* may be allophones. A high series (like *i*, *ü*, *u*) can be easily regarded as one notch more open than a fricative series (like *ɿ*, *ʒ*, *ɣ*). The reverse identification made by Martinet seems to have little to commend it. It is perhaps that Martinet is willing occasionally to consider 'front' vs. 'back' a binary contrast (like voicing) but is less eager to so regard 'open' vs. 'closed.' Such reasons are scarcely appropriate. On p. 73, Martinet refuses to analyze French *i*, *ü*, *u* into two binary contrasts (front-back, round-unrounded) and says that to do so would be "déformer la réalité." On the contrary, to consider all three as equal in complexity, without noting the special structural character of *ü*, seems to me a distortion of reality. Such structural relevance shows up very commonly in frequency counts of phonemes, where, as Zipf hinted (cf. pp. 132 ff.), the more complex phonemes (e. g. *ü*, *u*, *ö*, *o* in Turkish) are often considerably less frequent than the simpler ones (*i*, *ɿ*, *e*, *a*). This complexity also very often has a bearing on historical developments, and it appears somewhat unwise for Martinet, in his passionate opposition to 'binarisme,' to throw the tool away entirely.

Among his arguments against binarity in a series like *p t k q* is the nonattestation of a *direct* passage from *k* to *p* or vice versa. He would presumably reject Kurylowicz's theory of IE *k* (velar) > West

IE $k^w >$ Celtic, Oscan-Umbrian p , but in any case this is not *direct*. But in this sense, scarcely any change *is* direct. A shift of b (voiced) to p (fortis) generally involves at least one intermediate stage, voiceless h or lenis p , though he accepts binary opposition here. The perfect answer to this argument would, of course, be a language in which p and k are allophones. Although I cannot cite such a language, I should not be surprised if one turned up; and among fricatives, the parallel ϕ and x as allophones can be cited as probable in earlier Japanese, and some interchange between β or v and γ is also known. His chief argument against binarity in vowel systems is the continuity of possible vowel qualities; this is to deny the binarity of the comparative degree. Loudness or amplitude is also continuously variable, but many languages have a clear binary contrast between stressed (relatively louder) and unstressed vowels. Even Martinet's articulatory absolutes, the different stop 'positions' (p t k , etc.) can be made to shade into each other in continuous gradation, not only by pattern-playback machines, but by the human articulators. Here our kinesthetic sense often deceives us; if we produce an extreme retroflex (apico-velar) ta , it will be heard by impartial observers as some sort of ka , though we may 'feel' it to be definitely a kind of ta . And competent ventriloquists can produce clear and indubitable p 's without closing the lips.

Still, I think we must grant this much to the objections raised by Martinet (and others): (1) it is probably a mistake to give any list of 10 or 15 possible binary oppositions and say that these are all; even the same set of phonemes may perhaps fruitfully be analyzed differently in two different languages; (2) binary contrasts of linear phonemes are of two kinds (at least), one which seems somehow additive, and another which is rather polar or relative in nature (more or less of a given acoustic feature), and the latter do seem more arbitrary than the former. To some extent our naive feelings about this are perhaps illusory; voicing can be of various degrees of strength, some of which are automatically classed as voiceless, others as voiced, and so also with nasalization, affrication, glottalization, aspiration, and many other similar "additive" features. Still the absence of these features may be absolute, whereas absolutely 'diffuse' or 'compact' phonemes are not so easy to imagine. With regard to the first point, types of binary contrast which seem to be structurally useful in the description of many vowel systems, though not allowed for by Jakobson are, for instance, (1) 'extreme' vowels (i , u , a) versus non-extreme (e , o and sometimes ε , ɔ); within each group, then, the compact vs. diffuse (= low vs. high) and acute vs. grave (= front vs. back) contrasts may apply; and (2) normal vowels (back rounded, front unrounded— u , o , i , e) versus modified vowels (\ddot{u} , \ddot{o} , \ddot{i} , ə , etc.), which is often a structurally more relevant cut than that between flat and plain (i. e. rounded and unrounded) vowels. These look, from a phonetic point of view, like disjunctive concepts, hence a bit unesthetic or even unscientific; but they are of the type which can easily be given a conjunctive definition in negative form.

Martinet is skeptical (p. 105) about wholly unstructured systems; yet of the nine consonants of Cherokee (t k e n h s l w y) Martinet's principles would seem to allow no 'bundles' to be made at all, and

so, as far as I can see, no series and no order. At most he might make tk a series and yw another, but without correlation there is little point in so doing. A thorough-going binarist, of course, could structure these as three series (t e k "stop," l y w "glide," and n s h "continuant") in three orders (t l n "diffuse [apical]," e y s "acute [palatal]" and k w h "grave [velar]"), but Martinet would regard this as arbitrary and irrelevant.

But these are minor points. This is an important book, a fascinating book for anyone with any interest in language, whether linguist or not.

FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY.

JOHN H. FINLEY, JR. Pindar and Aeschylus. Cambridge, Mass.,
Published for Oberlin College by Harvard Univ. Press, 1955.
Pp. 307. (*Martin Classical Lectures*, Vol. XIV.)

Finley's book is by no means entirely "comparative"; yet inasmuch as he begins and ends with a comparison and on many other occasions works out parallels or emphasizes contrasts, one recalls other *συγκρίσεις* between these two poets. The best known is probably Eduard Meyer's in the *Geschichte des Altertums*, which Finley mentions early in his first chapter and to which he comes back in his "Conclusion." Meyer's primary concern was not with the poetic technique of Aeschylus and Pindar; though not indifferent to their personalities or individualities, he saw them primarily as representatives of their classes and, as one nowadays might say, sociological units. Pindar is for him the last spokesman of the aristocratic and chivalrous society; Aeschylus with his enthusiastic belief in the *polis*, in justice, and in progress, is the first clear and strong voice of the rising democracy. Later studies have borne ample testimony to the validity of this brilliant historical insight, and Finley too adopts it as a kind of major premise for his own approach. He, too, compares the two poets with regard to their outlook on life and their basic scheme of values. Yet his principal subject—as far as these matters can be separated—is their poetry, and while bringing to his task a subtle feeling for the differences of their artistic imagination he also tries to apply refined new methods of literary interpretation.

In Finley's own opinion, the most important of these *τεχνικά* is a study of poetic symbols. The first chapter gives us his theory of symbols, setting them apart from images and laying stress on an element of "intellectual" (*sit venia verbo*) meaning which symbols convey in a sensory medium. Finley's readers may find it a trifle difficult to discover exactly how wide a range he wishes to give to the concept of "symbols"; if theoretically inclined, they may wonder whether some of his penetrating analyses are really to any large extent concerned with symbols. By taking the concept in a more restricted sense one would realize more clearly how varied an equipment Finley carries into action and would in particular appreciate his strong feeling for the continuity of moods and motifs. The

task which he has set himself and to which all more specific results are subservient is nothing less than to understand the nature of Pindar's and of Aeschylus' poetic vision.

Aeschylus (if I may for a moment invert the sequence of Finley's book) sees Being and Rest as a goal to be realized in the divine order of things. This is the *τέλος* to which the complex evolutions of his tragedies, and especially of his trilogies, lead. "The sense of time and process is at the core of his thought" (p. 20). The tensions which threaten the harmony of things are in the end resolved; one-sided assertiveness, injustice, limitation of vision are each of them balanced by complementary elements, so as to become parts of a larger whole. Very persuasively Finley connects Aeschylus' absorption in change and his belief in progress with the enthusiastic, reformatory spirit of the young Athenian democracy. In Pindar this sense of history and upward development is absent. His conception of life is much more static. Yet he knows of points where life and its vicissitudes touch Being. At least the life of the better kind of men; for the others (*scil.* "those who failed the test," as Finley says in his convincing analysis of *Ol.* 2, p. 61) Pindar has little thought to spare. Flash-like the divine world enters that of man, shedding its radiance over a part of his existence. The great attainments, being manifestations of *ἀρετή*—specifically, yet not exclusively, the victories at the great national games—bridge the gulf which separates the two realms (*metaque fervidis evitata rotis palmaque nobilis terrarum dominos evehit ad deos* seems to say the same in a language less philosophic than Finley's and more realistically symbolic than Pindar's). Pindar's epinician odes, taking their starting point in such achievements, show earthly life heightened and illumined by the rays that fall into it from the divine and the heroic sphere—as Finley points out, the heroes are for Pindar and his contemporaries more remote than they had been in the days of the epic. If originally for Pindar divine sanction also embraced a large part of the social order in which he had been reared, the political developments of the 5th century brought with them a crisis of this confidence, and the mood and outlook of his poems correspondingly changes. In the works of his old age the light which once irradiated so large an area of mortal things has turned dim; it is in himself and in a more personal way that Pindar now feels the reality of a higher order. Finley rightly speaks of a new inwardness as characterizing Pindar's utterances of this period.

There has been an increasing tendency to perceive what one may call a Platonic stratum in Pindar's thought: a zone of values, of unchanging realities, of immortality through *ἀρετή*, the *τελείωσις* of man's life. Finley has made contributions of great value to our understanding of this central theme or element in Pindar's poetry. In addition, his study of the odes, one by one, opens our eyes to many beautiful features and discovers hidden connections between thoughts and motifs seemingly unrelated. There can be no doubt that much is concealed beneath the surface and that the interpreter should try to perceive the undercurrents of feeling and meaning on the rare occasions when they come into the open. Symbols, if cautiously traced, may prevent his imagination from crossing the borderline into mere subjectivity, always a *γείτων ὁμότοιχος*.

Finley's book embodies splendid examples of imagination successfully used, yet side by side with them also interpretations which one cannot accept with a good conscience. He clarifies our understanding of *Pythian* 1 where the ideas of Zeus' struggle and of Zeus' harmony carry over into the references to Hieron's relations to his newly founded city. He argues convincingly that the "Orphic motif" of *Olympian* 2 is quite compatible with Pindar's general outlook on life—a matter which has caused other Pindarists a good deal of unnecessary worry; and in dealing with the Iamos story of *Olympian* 6 he shows a delicate and sympathetic appreciation of its poetic qualities. Yet his comments on Heracles' planting of trees in Olympia (*Ol.* 3, 19 ff.): "As an earthly institution the games are shielded from the glare of full divinity" (p. 119) seem rather far-fetched and as there is no hint of this thought in the text—though it could be expressed in Pindaric language—it might be better not to use it as premise for further conclusions. *Nemean* 5 strikes Finley as "a poem of the sea, of movement, and of places beyond the sea" (p. 46). This may depend on the mood in which one reads it, yet the references to the sea are not so placed nor so related to one another and the whole as to make the impression inevitable; where the victor or others presumably have to cross the sea Pindar draws no attention to this fact, and if the imagination can supply this link one may still find it difficult to think of the sea as "interspace between two rests" or as "demanding a form of self-transcendence." In *Pythian* 11—a particularly elusive ode—Finley finds a contrast between the daughters of Cadmus invoked in the Proem and Clytaemnestra on whose deeds Pindar dwells later. It is true that "Clytaemnestra has lost the profound security and rootedness of the older heroines" (p. 164); yet how obvious or relevant is this truth? Throughout the book Finley overworks the concept of "rootedness" (why, one wonders, does he believe that the Greeks were so obsessed with this notion for which they barely had a word?); for the rest, since he himself admits that the contrast does not "quite come off," would it not be better to admit that no contrast of the kind is intended? And even if this Clytaemnestra was conceived under the influence of Aeschylus' play—which is far from certain—it goes too far to postulate that "she carried" for Pindar "suggestions of Athens in her destruction of old and founded relationships"; for while her hostile son is here a Λάκων, she herself can hardly be an Athenian heroine. In *Nem.* 8 a sentiment on which Finley waxes enthusiastic ("it is impossible to overpraise this feeling for youth . . .") is with the best of will not to be found in the text. Finley appears to have misunderstood v. 3 which does not refer to the youth but to the lover; the word "child" which Finley adds in his rendering deprives the preceding line of its meaning (cf. Farnell's translation and Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* [Berlin, 1922], p. 460). For the famous opening of *Olympian* 1 Finley proposes a new interpretation; in his view "water" suggests poetry, "gold" the heroes, and the "sun" the gods; yet in spite of the passages from other poems which he adduces I cannot find this "symbolic" interpretation more convincing than the customary "stylistic" one (as worked out among others by Wilamowitz, Dornseiff, and Hermann Fränkel).

There are other points where one cannot readily assent; yet in the

balance the good and solid outweighs the precarious. Finley's enthusiasm and feeling for poetic values carry the reader along and recreate the atmosphere of the lectures. Still, one may wish that between the lectures and the publication the parallels from Dante and other poets had been reduced to a few that are valid and significant and that some rather sweeping judgments and equations had been revised (an instance of the latter is the identification, p. 75, of Heaven and Earth in Hesiod with "spirit" and "matter"; the Stoics had more excuse for practising this kind of exegesis; would not Finley himself, when looking at *Theog.* 474 ff., 494, 626, 884, agree that Gaea has quite remarkable qualities of intellect?).

With Aeschylus Finley deals more briefly, yet the originality of his approach is again apparent on every page, and even when he restates views and explanations on which there is now fortunately more or less general agreement his presentation is fresh and enjoyable. His own contributions consist largely in the application of certain general categories and antitheses like male and female, achievement and community, creativity and Earth (e. g., p. 248), Space and fixity of place, rootedness and heroism. As I put them here they sound more abstract than they are, and I believe that if applied with restraint (τῇ χειρὶ σπεῖρειν μὴδ' ὅλῳ τῷ θυλάκῳ was said to be Corinna's advice to Pindar) they may add to our understanding of the plays. For Finley they become ultimates of Aeschylus' poetic vision. There is too much of them; and though the danger that they may impart a romantic instead of a Hellenic coloring is by and large averted by Finley's good sense and tact, they still enter to an unwarranted degree into the analysis of the plays.

Atossa, we are told, "is a figure of place and commitment." "Her offerings from the earth describe her." "The Athenians' veneration for place, kindred, and local gods is as great as Atossa's and these ties temper and direct their creativity, as to Darius' mind Xerxes' creativity was not tempered" (p. 216). Here are truths and half-truths, and perhaps also less than half-truths (like the arbitrary inference from the offerings), yet it is their combination and juxtaposition which give us a feeling of losing ground. There may be gain in regarding Zeus and Prometheus as exhibiting in different ways the limitation and incompleteness of "male creativity" instead of following Aeschylus' lead and thinking of the one as *τύραννος* and of the other as *αὐθάδης*. Thus we do reach something ultimate, and the problem of "creativity" is certainly present. Granted, then, creativity, and granted also—though with hesitation—that "the city state's rootedness in land and place" is "a necessary complement to (Prometheus') heroism" (p. 230), can one believe that this complementary factor is "from the first implicit, if unrealized, in Prometheus through his mother" (*scil.* Earth)? Behind this statement which appeals to, but also puts a strain on, one's sense for intangibles, there is the conviction that Gaea is likely to play a role in the later parts of the trilogy where the antinomy must find its resolution. The conviction as such is well founded; yet when it comes to details, Finley subjects the fragmentary material to some rather bold manipulations. Prometheus, he suggests, would not have come to terms with Zeus "except for a sign of suffering in Zeus and a sign moreover which betrayed ties with earth and man"

(p. 227). Zeus suffered in the person of his son Heracles (partly in Heracles' labors, partly in his love for him); and when Prometheus prophesies Heracles' labors which will take him to various parts of the world, "Prometheus' mind encompasses the earth." If this is the tie between Zeus and Earth, it is rather tenuous, not to say unsubstantial. To strengthen his case about Gaea's important role, Finley might have mentioned that tradition did not assign to Prometheus Gaea as his mother. Aeschylus must have had reasons for his innovation. However, the same tradition, *scil.* Hesiod's *Theogony*, gave him Gaea as mother of the Erinyes, and Aeschylus, it would seem, cared so little for the ties with Earth and Nature that in the *Eumenides* he made Night instead of Earth their mother. Would he have done this if Earth and "rootedness" really meant so much to him?

Finley may feel that objections of this kind do not penetrate to the substance of his ideas. This may well be true. The intuitive quality of many views he puts forward makes them vulnerable, though the reviewer confesses to wondering whether by discussing them he has not forced them too much into the clear light of the day while their strength lies rather in a certain suggestiveness and in a feeling for *imponderabilia* which may often be right even if it cannot be substantiated and made cogent. In putting down the book one may regret that not everything is as good as the best of it. Yet to the good and best in it we shall remain indebted. One's perception has been enriched, and when in future we return to Pindar or to Aeschylus it will not be long before we also renew the stimulating acquaintance with Finley's valuable study.

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

MARTHA W. HOFFMAN LEWIS. *The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians: A Study of the Nobility from 44 B. C. to 68 A. D.* American Academy in Rome, 1955. Pp. 186. (*Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome*, XVI.)

This substantial, valuable monograph is an expansion of a dissertation written under the direction of Professors Taylor and Broughton. It is divided into two parts, followed by a brief conclusion. The first and longer deals with the four major colleges of priests: the *pontifices*, augurs, *quindecimviri*, and, now in the Empire, *septemviri epulones*. After a short introduction covering their duties, number, selection, importance, and the like, there are documented membership lists for each college. So far as possible the priests are arranged in the order in which they were coopted within the periods 44-29, 28-12, 11 B. C.—A. D. 14, 15-23, 24-37, 37-54, 54-68. Tables which follow analyze the priests, basically as patricians and plebeians, and then within each group according to such categories as Old and New Patricians, Old and New Families, and New Men. Finally, short chapters are devoted to a discussion of each college, the priesthoods of the imperial family, and a com-

parison of the four major colleges. Part II of the monograph covers the *sodalitates* and other minor priesthoods in the same fashion. The Conclusion compares the priests with senators in general and with consulars. There are indexes of priesthoods and names.

The study, then, consists of two elements: the lists of priests and the summaries, comments, and conclusions based on them. The lists, the first to be prepared in over fifty years, are obviously the essential part of the work and its main contribution. Unless one were engaged in a similar investigation, it would be impossible without extended use to give assurances that the lists are complete and entirely accurate. But they appear to be carefully prepared and are based on a wide acquaintance with the sources and standard works in early imperial prosopography. The conclusions and comments, as is to be expected, agree generally with accepted views: e. g., the high percentage of patricians in the priesthoods, the steady decline and disappearance of patrician families, a higher proportion of new men among consulars than among priests. Professor Lewis uses her statistics as a basis for interesting discussions of the policies followed by the emperors towards the patricians and other groups among the senators. To be sure, the evidence is not only admittedly fragmentary but to some extent of doubtful or limited significance. But her judicious, well-informed remarks will be read with attention and interest.

Despite the solid merits of the study, there are reservations and objections to be made, some of a general character and others on points of detail. To begin with, there is an understandable but excessive preoccupation with patricians. The basic categories of patrician and plebeian seem more appropriate for the Republic than for the period covered. The patricians are no longer as stable, homogeneous, and clearly defined a group, and conclusions based on their representation in these lists at any particular time seem both more uncertain and less important. Professor Lewis keeps such points in mind, but not always. As an illustration of complications caused by the varied and changing composition of the patriciate in the Empire one may consider the statement that "the marked increase under Claudius of patrician priests indicates an aggressive policy favoring patricians" (p. 165). Part of the increase (what part is not shown in any table) is explained by Claudius' own creations in 48, men already picked out for favor and some at least presumably already priests. One could as well say that the increase reflects Claudius' decision to favor certain plebeians by making them patricians. To create new patricians was hardly a Republican procedure, and Tiberius' failure to do so in itself does not necessarily show hostility to patricians (pp. 164-5). Can we assume that the Old Patricians regarded the addition of Veranii or Vitellii to their ranks as a favor, any more than the senate as a whole did the admission of Gauls? We are told that "it is significant of the higher distinction accorded a priesthood that the proportion of new men among priests was lower than among consuls" (p. 169). This is undoubtedly true, as far as it goes. But one could arrive at a similar conclusion comparing the membership of Victorian cabinets and Knights of the Garter or of the Thistle.

The lists of priests reflect the same rather narrow point of view.

The data in each case include whether the man was a patrician, whether he was himself a new man and something about his family (ennobled in the Empire, praetorian family in the Republic, and the like), and the year of his consulship or the highest magistracy held. As a rule, the reader is not told much more. It makes no difference so far as these lists are concerned whether Manius Lepidus (p. 43, no. 33) was or was not *capax imperii*; cf. R. Syme, *J. R. S.*, XLV (1955), pp. 22-33. No one would expect full documentation along the lines of the *P. I. R.*, but as it is, there is nothing to indicate what part these men played in public life and which of the various careers open to senators they followed. It is a common observation that many patricians served as priests and magistrates in Rome and perhaps held a post or two in a senatorial province, but never governed an imperial province or commanded troops. Such matters are not considered, but unless they are one cannot really know what kind of men these priests were. Professor Lewis does remark that new men who became priests had eminent careers (p. 169), which of course is what one would expect. A question which arises here is how many of them received their priesthoods late as a distinction crowning their careers and how many, like Lucan, received them early. It is natural that Professor Lewis should always assume the former, but men entering upon a senatorial career, including those from new families, were often picked when very young for appointments leading to high office and responsible positions; see E. Birley, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XXXIX (1953), pp. 197-214.

In this matter of placing priesthoods in careers, the author in some instances has relied too much on the order of offices in inscriptions, reaching conclusions that are uncertain or improbable in varying degrees. The more important priesthoods were often listed out of chronological order; see e.g., Cagnat, *Cours d'épigraphie*⁴, p. 97. When a governor of Africa is described as *consul*, *augur*, *proconsul* (and it was a common practice to mention only the consulship and priesthood in addition to the current office), it is not safe to conclude that he became *augur* after his consulship even if earlier offices are listed chronologically. The point is important enough to cite some examples. It seems uncertain that Rubellius Blandus (p. 33, no. 35) became *pontifex* only while serving as *proconsul Africae* in 35/36, despite the order of offices in *I. R. T.*, 330-1; the sequence *cos.*, *pont.*, *procos.*, the regular one in inscriptions naming proconsuls, is found in *I. R. T.*, 269. Though a new man, Blandus had been *quaestor divi Augusti*, was consul suffect as early as 18, and married Tiberius' granddaughter in 33. It seems highly improbable that Ser. Cornelius Scipio Salvidienus Orfitus, a patrician of ancient family and *consul ordinarius* in 51, became *pontifex* only after his consulship (p. 35, no. 45). Professor Lewis assumes so because of *I. R. T.*, 341: . . . *quaestor divi Claudii, pr. urb., cos., pontif., sodalis Augustalis, procos., patronus dedicavit*. . . . The same is true of L. Nonius Asprenas (pp. 60-1, no. 25), whose *cursus* concludes *cos., VIIvir epulonum, procos. provinciae Africae, patronus municipii dedicavit* . . . (*I. R. T.*, 346). On the other hand, the reason is not apparent why the author regards M. Pompeius Silvanus (a plebeian consul suffect in 45) as *quindecimvir* under

Tiberius (p. 53, no. 39) when apparently the only evidence is in two inscriptions describing him as *cos.*, *XVvir s. f.*, *procos.* in A. D. 53/54. It is also not quite clear why when the two priesthoods appear in the same texts (A. D. 42/43), Q. Marcius Barea Soranus is listed as "perhaps *quindecimvir* under Tiberius" (pp. 52-3, no. 35) and as a *fetialis* "elected under Caligula and Claudius" (p. 139, no. 8). The more important priesthood is named first, but may well have been received later. Similar comments could be made in other cases: p. 35, no. 47; p. 42, no. 27; p. 46, no. 52; p. 51, no. 27.

Since so much depends on the classification of priests as patricians and plebeians, accuracy is essential. I am unable to consult Heiter's *De patriciis gentibus*, but there is no reason to doubt that the author is correct in practically all cases. However, the evidence itself is not always conclusive, and there are a few disquieting items. Professor Lewis regards the Aelii Lamiae as plebeians, while Syme, *Roman Revolution*, p. 382 states that they were made patricians in 29 B. C. If there is uncertainty, the reader should be informed. M. Licinius Crassus Frugi, *consul ordinarius* in 14 B. C., is classed as a plebeian (p. 42, no. 27 and p. 47). His son (probably) of the same name is classed as a patrician (p. 32, no. 28; cf. also p. 71). Again, Asinius Marcellus is described as "probably patrician after 29" (pp. 141 and 153). Some explanation of what is in doubt might have been given; evidently it is not whether Asinius Pollio became a patrician (see p. 50, no. 19). For a discussion of the Asinii Marcelli see J. H. Oliver, *A. J. P.*, LXVIII (1947), pp. 155-7.

There are one or two miscellaneous points that perhaps deserve comment. As regards . . . uttiedius L. f. Afer (p. 47, no. 54), despite Professor Lewis' statement Dessau neither dates the inscription in the time of the triumvirate nor identifies Afer with Tedijs Afer. He mentions the identification, proposed by Borghesi, and comments: *sed hic titulus videtur aliquanto recentior fuisse* (*P. I. R.*, p. 492, no. 692). Degrassi, *I fasti consolari*, p. 139 dates Afer "sec. I?". Possibly there is some connection between Uttiedius Afer (the copies do not indicate that the nomen is incomplete) and the senatorial Utteidii of the middle of the second century (*C. I. L.*, VIII, 10999 = *I. R. T.*, 232 and *Ann. épigr.*, 1931, no. 38). For the name Utt(i)edius see Schulze, *Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, p. 202. The categories Old and New Families in the tables on pp. 64-7 will not be entirely clear to readers who do not happen to find the explanation given on p. 13.

To conclude, this monograph is a valuable contribution which deserves a cordial welcome from students of the period. My criticisms in large part amount to regret that the author has not given us more, and one may hope that she will continue her investigations so fruitfully begun.

J. F. GILLIAM.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA.

E. A. LOWE. *Codices Latini Antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century. Part VII: Switzerland.* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1956. Pp. xi + 61; 50 plates. \$22.40.

It is almost impossible to say anything in praise of *Codices Latini Antiquiores* that has not been said before. Let me, then, begin with the modest statement that the latest volume of the series has in abundance all those qualities which we have come to expect. There is a wealth of material, concisely and lucidly presented; there is a very high standard of workmanship on the part of all concerned, from Dr. Lowe's assistants at the Princeton Institute to the printers of the Oxford Press; there is, above all, the author himself, who with every comment he makes gives fresh proof not only of the breadth and depth of his knowledge but also of the wisdom and charm that are so characteristically his.

The volume under review, which covers the libraries of Switzerland, is more uniform in content than any of its predecessors. It centres round the early manuscripts of Swiss scriptoria, with products of Italy, France, Ireland, and England, now in the possession of Swiss libraries, as runners-up. The autochthonous Swiss material comes almost entirely from two centres: Chur and the Saint Gall-Reichenau area. Palaeographically, most of these specimens represent two well-defined types, Rhaetian and Alemannic minuscule, which are characteristic of Chur and Saint Gall-Reichenau respectively. There are, however, points of contact. In Saint Gall 193 we find a Rhaetian and an Alemannic hand side by side; and the main hand of Saint Gall 125, which Lowe, on good grounds, terms Alemannic, has, to my eye at least, a Rhaetian touch. Both centres develop their distinctive scripts during the second half of the eighth century, but Alemannic minuscule has—for us in retrospect—a longer (or shall we say, a more detailed?) history: from the groping and somewhat capricious hand of Liutfrid in the 750's through Winithar (who gets a sympathetic and almost personal appreciation in Lowe's introduction) to the more stereotyped products at the turn of the century.

Many of these manuscripts belong now to the famous *Stiftsbibliothek* of Saint Gall. There we find also a very representative collection of books in Insular hands¹ and a considerable number of early fragments and palimpsests, mainly from Italy. The palimpsests, conveniently listed in the preface, are by no means confined to texts of the classics; beside the (partly palimpsested) Virgil in square capitals, the Terence in rustic capitals, and Merobaudes in uncials, we find the well-known *Sortes Sagallenses* (saec. VI ex.), but also a certain amount of biblical, liturgical, and patristic texts which, for some reason, had gone out of use.

Apart from palimpsests, classical authors are practically absent. Non-Christian literature is almost entirely technical, with grammar

¹ Another collection of fragments in Insular hands, probably from Fulda or some other German-Insular centre, is in the University Library of Bâle.

in the lead. A name most frequently encountered is that of the great Christian polyhistor, Isidore of Seville. The biblical scholar will find, *inter alia*, the venerable Old Latin fragments *n* and *a*² in fifth century uncials, and what is probably the earliest copy of the Vulgate Gospels now in existence (Saint Gall 1395, with fragments in Zurich and St. Paul, Carinthia), written in a beautiful early half-uncial, which, in Lowe's opinion, possibly dates from the time of St. Jerome himself.

Dated manuscripts (except, of course, those written by Winithar of Saint Gall, whose *floruit* falls in the 760's) are few in number; most of them belong to the second half of the eighth century. Their value lies mainly in the help they afford for dating hands of the Alemannic type; only one dated manuscript, the famous Gelasian Sacramentary, Saint Gall 348, which was written for bishop Remedius of Chur, *ca.* 800, is Rhaetian. There are also two landmarks of earlier date: the uncial of Eusebius-Hieronymus, Berne 219, written before A.D. 699-700, and especially the Schaffhausen Adamnan, written by Dorbbéne of Iona in or before A.D. 713—one of the few dated specimens of early Irish minuscule. Less certain is the computus of A.D. 727, Berne 611; its date is, strictly speaking, merely a *terminus a quo*, but, in Lowe's careful wording, this is "not incompatible with the palaeography of the manuscript."

Of special groups I note two. The one is obvious, viz. the linking-up of the Isidore fragment, Saint Gall 1399a, in seventh century Irish minuscule, with the "Bobbio group," best known from Usserianus I (*r*₁). The links which bind the other group together (see comment on Saint Gall 108) are more subtle and will be fully appreciated only when all the members of the group (including two German items) are brought together.

In one instance I would voice dissent from Lowe's terminology. The minuscule of Saint Gall 1394, fol. 105/106 (no. 981), which he calls "early Caroline" is, to my mind, no more Caroline than is the "pre-Caroline" script of Saint Gall 731. Judgment in such matters is, of course, largely a question of degrees, and Lowe has met in advance objections on these grounds with his pertinent remarks on the problem of nomenclature (p. viii).

The last page of the introduction is given entirely to acknowledgments. Dr. Lowe is a master in the art of *gratiarum actio*, and he is most generous in its exercise. I feel that the obligation of gratitude is in a far higher degree on the side of his readers, who gladly add this volume to the earlier six and look forward eagerly to the remaining three, publication of which is now well in sight.

LUDWIG BIELER.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, Vols. V and VI: Fish, Bread and Wine. Pp. xxii + 205; 186 figs.; xii + 261; 269 figs. New York, Pantheon Books, 1956. (*Bollingen Series*, XXXVII.)

This significant work which, as far as it was previously published, was noted here before, has now been enlarged by two more volumes. They deal with the symbolic value of fish, bread and wine. With the subject matter thus limited, the author is able to treat it very thoroughly both in the text and with illustrations. The author's point of view is the same as in the previous volumes, namely he proves that such symbols spread from people to people and from religion to religion, occasionally changing their significance without ever ceasing to have one. For instance fish is generally regarded as a purely Christian symbol owing to the identification of ΙΧΘΥΣ with the Saviour. But the author shows that, in Judaism, the fish expressed hope of immortality—that is: it already had a symbolic significance. Furthermore, the author maintains, and I quote: "Jewish usage of fish and other sea creatures must be compared with pagan usage of the same symbol before we can evaluate the significance of the Jewish instances."

Goodenough sees a similar evolution—from paganism via Judaism to Christianity—in the bread symbol, both by itself and bread in a container. Wine he enlarges into a symbol of "Divine Fluid." All of this must be considered as excellent. At times, though, the present reviewer is doubtful whether these objects are really depicted on some works of art. Goodenough is of the opinion that previous researchers wrongly interpreted as being purely decorative some things which today, with truer insight, are put down as symbols. The present reviewer can not completely agree with either the one or the other school of thought. He believes that in ancient art—especially folk art—both the symbolic and the decorative may occur, even on one and the same object. It is then the task of the investigator to judge each instance individually whether it be decoration or symbol. To illustrate the point: Goodenough will interpret as a bread every round object, even when he finds it on a clay lamp. He thus gives it symbolic meaning. The present writer can, in this instance, see only a decoration, attributable to the vital need, in folk art, to fill empty spaces.

This objection to Goodenough's Pan-Symbolism—as I would call his tendency—was voiced by the present writer in his previous review here. It is again voiced, but in no wise should it serve the purpose of diminishing the value of the book as a whole. It remains a standard work of utmost significance, and we anticipate its completion in subsequent volumes with eagerness.

FRANZ LANDSBERGER.

FERNANDO DE ALMEIDA. *Egitânia: história e arqueologia*. Lisbon, 1956. Pp. 452; 188 pls.; 5 maps.

Egitania is the name attested for the city of the Igaeditani under the Sueves in A. D. 569 and throughout the Visigothic Period (A. D. 585-715). On Kiepert's map of Lusitania it appears as Igaedi, but there seems to be no direct evidence for this name nor for the ethnic Igaeditanienses. An inscription of B. C. 16 records a dedication to the *Igaeditani*, a statue of C. Caesar was set up by the *civitas Igaedit(anorum)*, and there are other early references to *Igaedit(ani)* or *Igedit(ani)* or *Icaeditani*, but never to *Igaeditanienses*, not even in No. 77 of the very useful corpus compiled by Dr. Fernando de Almeida, who practices medicine in Lisbon and archaeology at Idanha-a-Velha in central Portugal near the Spanish frontier.

Dr. de Almeida has reversed the usual custom of excavating first and writing afterwards. He became interested in the site and made a study which awakened sufficient interest elsewhere to elicit funds for an excavation, which has already commenced as he reports in the addenda. In his history of Egitania he devotes special attention to the various periods of the church on the site of the Visigothic cathedral; he establishes the list of the bishops of Suevian and Visigothic Egitania and the Masters of the Templars who resided at Idanha-a-Velha from the XIIth to the XIVth centuries, and he follows the vicissitudes of the locality on down to the present; but it is, above all, the abundant material he has collected and analyzed from the period of the Roman Principate that will draw the attention of classicists. The inscriptions from the area in and around the site, of which at least one hundred and eighty are ancient, constitute the largest group from any one site in Portugal. Individually they are not too exciting, but they have been published in a way to do honor to the editor and to Professor Scarlat Lambrino (now of Lisbon). The index and the large number of photographs deserve special mention. Since the photographs are so useful, two more typographical errors of reference should be corrected to read as follows: No. 143 Fig. 161, No. 145 Fig. 139.

What makes this collection of inscriptions fascinating is the Celtic nomenclature of the inhabitants, as Dr. de Almeida has not failed to point out. There was a gradual Romanization, but the Celticism of this Lusitanian community resisted for a long while. In No. 17 the spelling FLAVS represents a widespread orthographical simplification of double V (cf. Mariné, *Inscripciones hispanas en verso* [Barcelona, 1952], p. 28). The archaizing No. 60, except for the name, may be scanned as two hexameters:

Pubescens ego nec veritus miserabile funus,
 Anceitus Celti,
 fata tulei brevia, heic situs. Heic, cineres, este quietei.

Of course the final syllable of *cineres* must be elided. Nos. 57 and

117 preserve the formula *Tu qui legis ave, qui perlegisti vale*. In the addenda the author publishes a dedication to Liber pater and to Libera by an ex-cavalryman, L. Marcius Maternus, who erected also No. 21, the only *cursus honorum*, that of his commanding officer, L. Marcius Avitus, *praef(ectus) eq(uitum) alae I singular(ium) c(ivium) R(omanorum)*.

No. 131, which reads *Tapora Leurī, Lantutra Caturonis*, brings the answer to one question concerning the name Leurus. Hitherto the name has appeared only in a single family represented by A. P., XI, 16 and by inscriptions cited in *Hesperia*, Suppl. VI (1941), under No. 31 (cf. J. A. O. Larsen, "A Thessalian Family under the Principate," *C. P.*, XLVIII [1953], pp. 86-95). The photograph clearly bears out Dr. de Almeida's reading, and his doubtless correct identification of the name in the inscription at Egittania as Celtic explains why the name is so rare in Greece. Students of Roman prosopography, accordingly, owe to Egittania not only the equestrian *cursus honorum* of No. 21 but the interesting indication that the Roman consul and Athenian archon M. Ulpus Eubiotus Leurus, son of M. Ulpus Leurus, sprang from a family in which an old Celtic name was traditional.

JAMES H. OLIVER.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

INDEX TO VOLUME LXXVIII.

	PAGE		PAGE
Achaea, Roman Imperial Troops in Macedonia and,	52-62	Elements in Certain Ora- tions and the <i>Prooemia</i> of,	287-296
<i>Aeneid</i> III: A New Approach,	133-151	DOREY, T. A. Macedonian Troops at the Battle of Zama,	185-187
<i>Aeneid</i> III and the Aeneas Legend,	382-400	DORJAHN, ALFRED P. Extem- poraneous Elements in Certain Orations and the <i>Prooemia</i> of Demosthenes,	287-296
Aerarius Aper, The Epitaph of, at Tarraco,	152-162	DOUGLAS, A. E. The Legisla- tion of Spurius Thorius: Corrigenda,	89
Ancient (The) Dispute over Rhetoric in Homer,	23-35	Epitaph (The) of Aerarius Aper at Tarraco,	152-162
Archonship (The) of Symma- chos,	375-381	Extemporaneous Elements in Certain Orations and the <i>Prooemia</i> of Demosthenes,	287-296
Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i> , 1354-1356, A Note on the <i>πίστεως</i> in,	188-192	FOWLER, BARBARA HUGHES. The Imagery of the <i>Pro- metheus Bound</i> ,	173-184
Assembly, The Centuriate, Be- fore and After the Reform,	337-354	Function (The) of the Ho- meric Simile,	113-132
Bantia, The Latin Law of,	163-172	Greek, Modern, Corrections to Buck's <i>Dictionary</i> ,	401-413
BOOKS RECEIVED, 111-112, 334-336		GRIMALDI, WILLIAM M. A., S. J. A Note on the <i>πίστεως</i> in Aristotle's <i>Rhet- oric</i> , 1354-1356,	188-192
Buck's <i>Dictionary</i> , Modern Greek Corrections to, 401-413		GRUBE, G. M. A. Notes on the <i>περί ψυχῆς</i> ,	355-374
Categories, The Stoic,	63-82	HERBERT, KEVIN. The Identity of Plutarch's Lost <i>Scipio</i> ,	83-88
Centuriate (The) Assembly Before and After the Re- form,	337-354	Homer, The Ancient Dispute over Rhetoric in,	23-35
CHERNISS, HAROLD. The Rela- tion of the <i>Timaeus</i> to Plato's Later Dialogues,	225-266	Homeric Simile, The Function of the,	113-132
Claudius and the Senators,	279-286		453
COFFEY, MICHAEL. The Func- tion of the Homeric Simile,	113-132		
Corrigenda: The Legislation of Spurius Thorius,	89		
Demosthenes, Extemporaneous			

	PAGE		PAGE
Identity (The) of Plutarch's		Note (A) on the <i>πίστεως</i> in	
Lost <i>Scipio</i> ,	83-88	Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i> , 1354-	
<i>I. G.</i> , II ² , 3194, On,	35	1356,	188-192
Imagery (The) of the <i>Prome-</i>		Notes on the <i>περί ὕψους</i> ,	355-374
<i>theus Bound</i> ,	173-184	OLIVER, JAMES H. The Epi-	
Imagery, Sunken, in Sophocles'		taph of Aerarius Aper at	
<i>Oedipus</i> ,	36-51	Tarraco,	152-162
Isocrates' Pupils, A Note on		On <i>I. G.</i> , II ² , 3194,	35
the Number of,	297-300	Palamedes, A Suggestion	
JOHNSON, R. A Note on the		about,	267-278
Number of Isocrates' Pu-		<i>Parisinus Latinus</i> 7930, The	
pils,	297-300	Scholium on Naevius in, 1-22	
KENNEDY, GEORGE A. The An-		<i>περί ὕψους</i> , Notes on the,	355-374
cient Dispute over Rhetor-		PHILLIPS, E. D. A Suggestion	
ic in Homer,	23-35	about Palamedes,	267-278
Latin (The) Law of Bantia,		Plato's Later Dialogues, The	
163-172		Relation of the <i>Timaeus</i>	
Legislation (The) of Spurius		to,	225-266
Thorius: Corrigenda,	89	Plutarch's Lost <i>Scipio</i> , The	
LLOYD, ROBERT B. <i>Aeneid</i> III:		Identity of,	83-88
A New Approach,	133-151	<i>Prometheus Bound</i> , The Im-	
<i>Aeneid</i> III and the Aeneas		agery of the,	173-184
Legend,	382-400	REESOR, MARGARET E. The	
McALINDON, D. Claudius and		Stoic Categories,	63-82
the Senators,	279-286	Relation (The) of the <i>Timaeus</i>	
Macedonia and Achaea, Roman		to Plato's Later Dialogues,	225-266
Imperial Troops in,	52-62	REVIEWS:	
Macedonian Troops at the		<i>Barker's</i> From Alexander to	
Battle of Zama,	185-187	Constantine. Passages and	
MERITT, BENJAMIN D. The		Documents Illustrating	
Archonship of Symmachos,		the History of Social and	
375-381		Political Ideas, 336 B. C.-	
Modern Greek Corrections to		A. D. 337. Translations	
Buck's <i>Dictionary</i> ,	401-413	with Introductions, Notes,	
MUSURILLO, HERBERT, S. J.		and Essays (ELIAS J.	
Sunken Imagery in Sopho-		BICKERMAN),	325-327
cles' <i>Oedipus</i> ,	36-51	<i>Bieber's</i> The Sculpture of	
Naevius, The Scholium on, in		the Hellenistic Age (J. H.	
<i>Parisinus Latinus</i> 7930, 1-22		YOUNG),	330-332
Note (A) on the Number of		<i>Bolgar's</i> The Classical Heri-	
Isocrates' Pupils,	297-300	tage and its Beneficiaries	
		(REVILO P. OLIVER), 307-313	
		<i>Brugnoli's</i> Studi sulle dif-	
		ferentiae verborum (WIL-	

	PAGE		PAGE
LIAM T. AVERY),	219-221	of Rome under the Julio-	
Chantraine, <i>see</i> Rose.		Claudians: A Study of the	
Chapouthier, <i>see</i> Rose.		Nobility from 44 B. C. to	
<i>Clarke's</i> The Roman Mind,		68 A. D. (J. F. GILLIAM),	
Studies in the History of			444-447
Thought from Cicero to		<i>Lobel and Page's</i> Poetarum	
Marcus Aurelius (KEVIN		Lesbiorum Fragmenta	
HERBERT),	214-217	(LLOYD W. DALY),	414-420
<i>De Almeida's</i> Egitânia: his-		<i>Lowe's</i> Codices Latini Anti-	
tória e arqueologia (JAMES		quiores. A Palaeographi-	
H. OLIVER),	451-452	cal Guide to Latin Manu-	
<i>Dilke's</i> Statius, Achilleid.		scripts Prior to the Ninth	
Edited with Introduction,		Century. Part VII: Swit-	
Apparatus Criticus and		zerland (LUDWIG BIELER),	
Notes (ROBERT J. GETTY),			448-449
	97-101	<i>Mariotti's</i> Il Bellum Poe-	
<i>Finley's</i> Pindar and Aeschy-		nicum e l'arte di Nevio	
lus (FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN),		(HENRY T. ROWELL),	420-427
	440-444	<i>Martinet's</i> Économie des	
Gigon, <i>see</i> Rose.		changements phonétiques	
<i>Goodenough's</i> Jewish Sym-		(FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER,	
bols in the Greco-Roman		Jr.),	433-440
Period, Vols. V and VI:		Mondésert, <i>see</i> Jalabert.	
Fish, Bread and Wine		Mouterde, <i>see</i> Jalabert.	
(FRANZ LANDSBERGER),	450	<i>Mulder's</i> Publii Papinii	
<i>Hackforth's</i> Plato's Phaedo:		Statii Thebaidos Liber Se-	
Translated with an Intro-		cundus commentario exe-	
duction and Commentary		getico aestheticoque in-	
(THOMAS G. ROSEN-		structus (ROBERT J. GET-	
MEYER),	321-325	TY),	94-97
<i>Herdan's</i> Language as Choice		<i>Nenci's</i> Pirro: Aspirazioni	
and Chance (JOSHUA		egemoniche ed equilibrio	
WHATMOUGH),	314-320	mediterraneo (JOHN V.	
† <i>Jalabert, Mouterde, Mondé-</i>		A. FINE),	108-111
<i>sert's</i> Inscriptions Grec-		<i>Page's</i> Sappho and Alcaeus,	
ques et Latines de la		an Introduction to the	
Syrie, Tome IV: Laodicée.		Study of Ancient Lesbian	
Apamène (Nos. 1243-1997).		Poetry (LLOYD W. DALY),	
Chronologie des Inscrip-			414-420
tions datées des Tomes I-			
IV (C. BRADFORD WELLES),		Page, <i>see</i> Lobel.	
	221-223	<i>Richter's</i> Ancient Italy: A	
Kitto, <i>see</i> Rose.		Study of the Interrela-	
Lenger, <i>see</i> Turner.		tions of its Peoples as	
<i>Lévêque's</i> Agathon (PATRI-		Shown in their Arts (J.	
CIA NEILS BOULTER),	327-330	H. YOUNG),	223-224
<i>Lewis' The Official Priests</i>		<i>Robert's</i> Hellenica: Recueil	
		d'épigraphie, de numisma-	

	PAGE		PAGE
tique et d'antiquités grecques, Volume X (JAMES H. OLIVER),	332	Roman Imperial Troops in Macedonia and Achaea,	52-62
<i>Rose, Chantraine, Snell, Gigon, Kitto, Chapouthier, Verdenius' La Notion du Divin, depuis Homère jusqu'à Platon. Sept exposés et discussions</i> (FRANCIS R. WALTON),	101-103	ROWELL, HENRY T. The Scholium on Naevius in <i>Parisinus Latinus</i> 7930,	1-22
<i>Ryberg's Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art</i> (OTTO J. BRENDL),	301-307	Scholium (The) on Naevius in <i>Parisinus Latinus</i> 7930,	1-22
Snell, <i>see</i> Rose.		Scipio, Plutarch's Lost, The Identity of,	83-88
<i>Stella's Il poema d'Ulisse</i> (FREDERICK M. COMBEL-LACK),	217-219	Senators, Claudius and the,	279-286
<i>Te Riele's Les femmes chez Eschyle</i> (ROBERT DUFF MURRAY, JR.),	333	SHERK, ROBERT K. Roman Imperial Troops in Macedonia and Achaea,	52-62
<i>Tjäder's Die nichtliterarischen lateinischen Papyri Italiens aus der Zeit 445-700. I, Papyri 1-28; III, Tafeln 1-160</i> (LIONEL CASSON),	103-108	Simile, The Function of the Homeric,	113-132
<i>Turner's The Hibeh Papyri, Edited with Translations and Notes (with the collaboration in the edition of No. 198 of M.T. Lenger)</i> (JOHN DAY),	428-433	Sophocles' <i>Oedipus</i> , Sunken Imagery in,	36-51
Verdenius, <i>see</i> Rose.		Spurius Thorius, The Legislation of: Corrigenda,	89
<i>Webster's Greek Theatre Production</i> (MARGARETE BIEBER),	206-213	Stoic (The) Categories,	63-82
<i>Whatmough's Language: A Modern Synthesis</i> (ROBERT A. HALL, JR.),	199-205	Suggestion (A) about Palamedes,	267-278
<i>Wilkinson's Ovid Recalled</i> (BROOKS OTIS),	90-94	Sunken Imagery in Sophocles' <i>Oedipus</i> ,	36-51
<i>Wolfson's The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, I: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation</i> (JOHN REUMANN),	193-199	SWANSON, DONALD C. Modern Greek Corrections to Buck's <i>Dictionary</i> ,	401-413
<i>Rhetoric in Homer, The Ancient Dispute over,</i>	23-35	Symmachos, The Archonship of,	375-381
		TAYLOR, LILY ROSS. The Centuriate Assembly Before and After the Reform,	337-354
		<i>Timaeus</i> , The Relation of the, to Plato's Later Dialogues,	225-266
		Troops, Macedonian, at the Battle of Zama,	185-187
		Troops, Roman Imperial, in Macedonia and Achaea,	52-62
		YARNOLD, E. J. The Latin Law of Bantia,	163-172
		Zama, Macedonian Troops in the Battle of,	185-187

PAGE

2-62

1-22

1-22

r-88

-286

1-62

132

-51

89

-82

278

-51

413

381

54

66

87

62

72

37

7
i
C
A
e
b
b
r
d
i

H
V
T
re
a
o
K
d
D
N

M

S

T
op

So
th
of
w
pr
is
of
gy
he
th
m
te

he
re
m

*The most complete reference work of its kind — now available
in a thoroughly revised volume.*

GREEK GRAMMAR

By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH; *Revised by* GORDON M. MESSING. This revised edition of the late Professor Smyth's *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* is sponsored by the Department of Classics of Harvard University. All necessary corrections have been made, and the book, long considered indispensable in the study of Greek, retains the form which has made it the classic work that it is. The result is a descriptive grammar that offers a treatment of Greek syntax as rich and subtle as it is well-organized. \$10.00

HARVARD STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

VOLUME 62

This new volume contains an essay by H. C. Bennett on Pindar; Herbert Bloch's renewed discussion of the Athenian Exegetes; M. H. Chambers on Thucydides' attitude toward Pericles; H. S. Commager, Jr., on Lucretius; Richard M. Gummere on the interest in classical myth among early settlers on this continent; George A. Kennedy on stylistic distinctions in ancient rhetoric; Philip Levine's study of the dramatic structure and form of Cicero's Dialogues, especially of the *De Natura Deorum*; Gustav Must on the linguistic problem of the inscription on Helmet B of Negau; and summaries of recent Ph. D. dissertations in Classical Philology. \$5.00

Order through your bookseller, or from



HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

79 GARDEN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

Medicine in the Time of Tiberius and Hadrian:

SORANUS' GYNECOLOGY

Translated with an Introduction by Owsei Temkin *with the assistance of* Nicholson J. Eastman, Ludwig Edelstein *and* Alan F. Guttmacher

Soranus, who practiced medicine in the early 2nd century A. D., was one of the most learned and lucid medical writers of antiquity. Of his works preserved in Greek, the *Gynecology* is the most important and revealing of his thought, representing ancient gynecology and obstetrics at their height. Indeed, many of Soranus' theories and techniques were part of medical practice as late as the sixteenth century.

Soranus is of added interest because he is regarded as the outstanding representative of a school of ancient medicine known as the "methodist"

sect. The methodists rivaled the older dogmatic and empirical sects, rejecting etiologial research and mere experience and concentrating on study of the phenomena of diseases themselves.

This translation, the first into English, was made from the most authoritative Greek text. It brings to the modern reader rich and fascinating insights into ancient medicine. The Introduction gives the background necessary to place the work in proper historical and scientific perspective.

308 pp., \$5.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Maryland
